

THE UNIVERSITY
OF ILLINOIS
LIBRARY

227.2

M 57k 5Eb ELD.

1884

Return this book on or before the
Latest Date stamped below.

University of Illinois Library

JAN 29 1960

APR 17 1979

APR 12 1979

MAY 08 1982

APR 14 1982

JUL 11 2006

[926]
0

225.7 MS-
LIBRARY OF THE
SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN
ASSOCIATION

CRITICAL AND EXEGETICAL

HAND-BOOK

TO THE

EPISTLES TO THE CORINTHIANS.

BY

HEINRICH AUGUST WILHELM MEYER, TH.D.

OBERCONSISTORIALRATH, HANNOVER.

TRANSLATED FROM THE FIFTH EDITION OF THE GERMAN BY

REV. D. DOUGLAS BANNERMAN, M.A.

THE TRANSLATION REVISED AND EDITED BY

WILLIAM P. DICKSON, D.D.

PROFESSOR OF DIVINITY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW.

WITH A PREFACE AND SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES BY

TALBOT W. CHAMBERS, D.D.

THE LIBRARY OF THE
MAY 23 1933
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS.

NEW YORK :
FUNK & WAGNALLS, PUBLISHERS,
10 AND 12 DEY STREET.
1884.

LIBRARY OF THE
UNITED STATES
ASSOCIATION

Entered, according to Act of Congress, in the year 1884,
By FUNK & WAGNALLS,
In the Office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington, D.C.

1884

The First Epistle gives us a very clear conception of the actual state of the ancient churches, their excellences and their defects, the relations in which their members stood to the unbelievers among whom they lived, the errors in practice to which they were exposed, their use and abuse of extraordinary gifts, their methods in worship, their application of Christian principles in the affairs of ordinary life, and the whole movement of events as a society of believers grew and developed in the midst of a great commercial city which was wealthy and refined, but at the same time unusually depraved. The conflict between light and darkness, right and wrong, truth and error, was of course much the

833564

2. 5. 33. Rech. univ. mch. lib. ANN ARBOR

same in all parts of the Roman world where the standard of the cross was raised and its adherents were gathered into a community, but nowhere was it carried on so intensely or at so many different points as in Corinth. Hence we are enabled to see here what was the true life of an apostolic church, to catch the spirit of its important movements and apprehend its mingled good and evil. The many questions of morality and casuistry which arose in this lively and intelligent population afford us a very clear insight into the feelings and opinions of the early Christians. The solution of these questions discloses the extraordinary versatility of the Apostle's mind, and his power of dealing with difficult and complicated matters as well as with unscrupulous opponents. "For every aberration he has a word of severe censure, for every danger a word of warning, for every weakness a word of cheer and sympathy, for every returning offender a word of pardon and encouragement."¹ Nor does he ever seem at a loss. Whatever the case, he is able to meet it. No point is evaded. He solves all questions by an appeal to Scripture, or to the words of Christ, or to his own immediate inspiration as an organ of the Holy Ghost. And he solves them for all places and ages. It is not by expedients or make-shifts, but by going to first principles, that he settles difficulties about ministerial support, or a litigious spirit, marriage rights and duties, fellowship with unbelievers, and the like. So that the directions apply not only to the specific circumstances that called them forth, but to innumerable others of a similar kind. Thus what at first sight is only a book of details, becomes in fact a book of principles.

The Second Epistle, while partaking in part of the character of the First, is chiefly remarkable for the degree in which it discloses to us the personal character and experience of its author. In many parts it is like an autobiography. A Judaizing party had been at work in Corinth sowing dissension and undermining the Gospel by impeaching the credentials, the claims, and the conduct of the Apostle. This puts him on his defence. He was compelled to vindicate himself, for he was a witness of the resurrection, a founder of churches, a channel of inspiration, a chosen vessel to bear the gospel to the Gentiles. Now if in the chief city of Greece, one connected closely by arts and trade with the East and the West, Paul's authority was struck down, and he was shown to be a man of words and not of deeds, a boaster, an intruder, vacillating in his purposes and selfish in his aims, the consequences could not fail to be disastrous. Here the character of the message was bound up with that of the messenger. If he were a man of mere secular impulses and without divine

¹ Schaff.

authority, all the churches from Antioch to Philippi would be sorely embarrassed. It was necessary then for the Apostle to discuss the matter fully and plainly, and establish beyond controversy the soundness of his claims as a representative of Christ and an organ of the Spirit. Hence the seemingly petty personal details, to which he refers so often and at so much length, are by no means to be attributed to an excess of egotism or self-consciousness, or even to be considered as pardonable flaws in what otherwise was a career of very great excellence, but are rather themselves to be highly prized, not simply as illustrations of character, but as valid proofs of that which is as important to-day as it was in the years 57, 58 of our era,—viz. the plenary authority of Paul as a penman of holy Scripture. Our Lord told the Twelve that he had much to say to them, but they were not able to bear it then (John xvi. 12); and he would therefore send a heavenly Paraclete, who would guide them into “all the truth,” so that the revelation of God’s mind and will for human salvation should be complete. It appears that the greater part of this supplementary disclosure came through Paul. So the New Testament represents the case. But if he were not what he professed to be, but were either an impostor or a self-deceiver, then the thirteen Epistles which bear his name are no guide in doctrine or duty, and the space they hold in the Scripture is a mere blank or worse. It is right then that the truth in this respect should be set forth, and the exhibition of it be preserved to our own day as a testimony that our faith is not in vain, nor are we following a cunningly devised fable.

The Epistle is a portrait of the Apostle, drawn unconsciously by his own hand. He opens his whole heart, relating his joys and his sorrows, his fears and his hopes, his labors, his trials, his anxieties, his steadfast faith and holy love, his disinterestedness, his self-sacrifice, his fidelity, and his courage. He refers or alludes to much of which we find no record in the Acts of the Apostles, and hence we get a far more vivid conception of his character than would otherwise be possible. He was a great man, measured by any standard we may choose to apply—great in intellect, in resources, in versatility, in application, in administrative faculty—but without the least tinge either of pride or vanity. He could not, of course, be unconscious of his gifts or of the work he was enabled to perform, but the thought of these things led him only to magnify the grace by which he came to be what he was. He was a man of energy and decision, who, if need were, could come with a rod and not spare, but the element of harshness so conspicuous in his course before conversion was wholly wanting. He pronounced a prompt judgment upon one who had erred, yet when discipline had wrought its destined purpose, he was urgent that the penitent offender should be restored, lest he

be swallowed up with overmuch sorrow. His zeal glowed like a torch through life, yet it never consumed the tenderness which is needed to make one mindful of the feelings of others. His sympathy was wide and deep and constant. It took in all classes and conditions and races of his fellow-men. Carried out as it was in word and act, as we see in the development of these Epistles, it entitles him justly to be called the benefactor of our kind, the foremost philanthropist of all time.

Here appropriately may be added a paragraph from Dr. Meyer's Preface to the fourth edition of his comment on the First Epistle, for some reason omitted in the fifth: "No apostolic writing transports us so directly and in such a lively manner into the varied concrete relations of the Church, as does this Epistle. It represents the peculiar development of the Christian Church life in one of the most brilliant seats of Grecian culture and heathen corruption, a development in which the victory of the cross over men's wickedness and their folly was more endangered, and the fulfilment of the apostolic entreaty, Be ye reconciled unto God, was encumbered with greater difficulties than anywhere else. But all the serious obstacles with which the world-subduing divine life had there to contend were met by the Apostle, who was the Lord's chosen instrument to convey this divine life, with a clearness and certainty of judgment, with a humility and elevation of consciousness, with a tenderness and boldness of utterance, with a never-failing tact, that make us follow him through the entire letter with a constantly increasing astonishment. And when one considers the Attic elegance, the Demosthenic force, the almost lyric elevation of his speech in which yet is heard the beating of the heart of Christ, we feel in truth at each step, how much more than Demosthenes is here, how much more than Homer and Pindar who have sung so highly the praises of *ὀλβία κόρινθος*. Ah, her true *ὀλβοφόρος* was the very man whom the people of the Areopagus disdained and the philosophers of Athens derided as a *σπερμολόγος*."

Dr. Meyer's treatment of these Epistles resembles his general style when handling other portions of the New Testament. He shows the same independence, research, insight, and careful study of the original text, which have given him his deserved pre-eminence among expositors of the Word. There appear also his two leading imperfections—viz. what is called *purism*, in adhering in all cases to strict grammatical forms, even when the sense seems to require another view, as for example in insisting that *ἵνα* always and everywhere is to be considered as having a *telic* force, and again in finding a reference to the Parousia in very many cases where such a reference is not obvious, and tends rather to perplex than to elucidate the connection. Still there is great satisfaction

in following a critic who is so keen and incisive, is so thoroughly acquainted with all the literature, both preceding and contemporary, connected with the matters in hand, and is so honest and fearless in stating the conclusions to which he has come and the grounds upon which they rest.

The notes appended to each chapter by the editor have been intended in a few cases to indicate dissent from the views of the author, but in the main to present such suggestions concerning the scope and application of the Apostle's words as have been derived from the labors of other writers. As Dr. Meyer in common with nearly all German critics omits to refer to English commentators, the editor has taken occasion to cite at times the opinions of such scholars as Stanley, Hodge, Poor, Principal Brown, Beet, and others who have given attention to these Epistles. The English translation has been revised throughout, but it was so carefully executed as very rarely to need correction. One of the features of the original work, the frequent and copious citation of Greek words and clauses, may render it less acceptable to lay readers, but ought to enhance its value to clerical students, since the careful study of these extracts will tend to increase their familiarity with the original tongue as well as to render them more intelligent and more competent judges of the merits of the author's opinions. And there are few authors in the whole domain of New Testament exegesis whose writings are so worthy of patient and prolonged study as those of the Oberconsistorialrath of Hannover who through a long life steadily grew step by step with his work, and by his profound study of the divine word obtained a more perfect experience of the saving grace and truth of the gospel.

The Topical Index at the end of the volume has been prepared by the Rev. G. F. Behringer, of Brooklyn, N. Y., who has kindly exercised a general supervision of the work while passing through the press.

T. W. CHAMBERS.

NEW YORK, *April 28th*, 1884.

PREFACE.

AFTER having been mainly occupied of late years with the historical books of the New Testament, I have now to turn to the Epistles of Paul, and to devote renewed labour to their exposition. In the present sadly distracted age of the church I feel the deep gravity and responsibility of the task which I have to face all the more strongly, because I cannot but bear in mind that among all the sacred writings, it was those very Epistles of Paul which were pre-eminently to the Reformers the conquering sword of the Spirit, and which exercised the most powerful influence in moulding the doctrinal system of our church. The characters of Paul and Luther form a historical parallel, to which nothing similar can be found in the whole series of God's chosen instruments for the furtherance of evangelical truth. We possess the divine light which Paul bore through the world, and in whose radiance the Reformers did their work; the whole Scripture, with all its treasures, becomes day by day more richly opened up to us by the labours of science; but everywhere, from the extreme right to the extreme left, there is party-strife; and, amid the knowledge that puffeth up, the unity of the Spirit is broken, faith languishes, and love grows cold. It is, in truth, as though we were giving all diligence to afford the confirmation of increasing experience to the malicious assertion of the Romanists, that Protestantism is already in full course of decomposition.

Our wounds will not be healed, but only deepened and widened, by arrogant boasting about our Confessions, which are after all but the works of men. Much less will the end be attained by a wanton attenuating, explaining away, or setting aside of the positive teachings of the N. T., and of the miraculous facts in the history of redemption; for these have subdued the world, and must continue to subdue it. Only in that which is and remains the "norma normans" for all faith and all teaching, and for the Confessions themselves,—only in the living word of revelation resides the God-given power to heal, which will promote the restoration to health, and the union of the body of the church, with surer and more lasting effect, just in proportion as the word is more clearly and fully understood and more truly and energetically appropri-

ated, and as, through such understanding and appropriation of it, the supremacy of the word and of its high moral forces becomes more absolute and all-controlling. To this sacred supremacy the church herself with her doctrine must bow as well as the individual. For in laying down her principle of appeal to Scripture, the church assumed not only the possibility and allowableness, but also the necessity of a further development and—where need should be shown—rectification of her doctrine in accordance with Scripture. In this way the Confession points to an authority transcending its own ; and the church, built as she is immovably upon the everlasting Rock, has placed herself under the law of growth, thereby giving augury of a future, which, according to the apostle's promise (Eph. iv. 13 ff.), despite all the sorrows of the present, will not fail to be realized. To aid in preparing for this bright future, is what all exposition of Scripture should recognize as its appointed task, being mindful at the same time that the steps in the development of the divine kingdom are centuries, and that the ways of Him who rules over it are not our ways. If, therefore, a thorough and conscientious searching of the Scriptures should arrive, as regards this or that point of doctrine, at results which are at variance with confessional definitions, its duty, at the bidding of the exegetical conscience, is not in an un-Lutheran and unprincipled fashion to disguise such results or to cloak them with a misty phraseology, but, trusting to the sifting and conquering power of divine truth, openly and honestly to hand them over to the judgment of science and the church. To science and the church, I repeat ; for it is one of the follies of the day to seek to set these at variance—to impose limits upon the former which are opposed to its essential nature, and to set aside its voice and relegate it to silence under an imaginary belief that a service is thereby rendered to the church. Such a piece of folly is unevangelical, and fit only for the *Tridentinum* and the Syllabus of the Bishop of Rome.

Now, if nothing save the pure word of God may or ought to prepare the way towards a better future for the church, then all expounders of that word have but one common aim placed before them,—namely, just to ascertain its *pure* contents, without addition or subtraction and with a renouncing of all invention of our own, with *simplicity, truth, and clearness*, without being *prejudiced* by, and *independent* of, dogmatic *à priori* postulates, with *philological precision*, and in strict *objectivity* as *historical fact*. Anything more than this they ought not as expositors to attempt ; but in this—and it is much—it is required of them that they be found faithful. The plan of procedure adopted may vary ; one may prefer the glossematic, another the inductive, method. I attach but little weight to this question of method in itself, although I cannot ignore the fact,

attested by various works appearing at the present day in the region of Old and New Testament exegesis, that the inductive mode runs more risk of giving to *subjective* exegesis a free play which should be rigorously denied to it. One is very apt, under the influence of this method, to give something more or less, or other than, the pure contents of the sacred text. The ingenuity, which in this way has ampler room for manipulating the premisses—how often with the aid of refining sophistry!—and thinks itself justified in so doing, always miscarries in spite of all its plausibility and confidence, when it gives to the world expositions that offend against grammar and linguistic usage, or against the general and special connection, or against both. Often in such cases the doubtful recommendation of novelty¹ is purchased only by strange strainings of the text and other violent expedients, while clearness has not unfrequently to be sought for beneath the cloak of a laboriously involved phraseology, which itself in its turn seems to require a commentary.

In preparing this fifth edition, which was preceded by the fourth in 1861, I have not neglected to give due attention to what has since been done for the criticism and exposition of the apostolic Epistle.² While thus engaged, I have very frequently, to my regret, found myself unable

¹ A great many entirely novel expositions of individual passages make their appearance nowadays, of which I apprehend that hardly a single one will on trial prove itself correct. Not that I am unduly attached to the traditions of exegesis; but long experience and observation in this field of scientific inquiry have taught me that—after there have been expended upon the N. T., in far greater measure even than upon the O. T., the labours of the learning, the acuteness, the mastery of Scripture, and the pious insight of eighteen centuries—new interpretations, undiscerned hitherto by the minds most conversant with such studies, are destined as a rule speedily to perish and be deservedly forgotten. I am distrustful of such exegetical discoveries; and those of the present day are not of a kind to lessen my distrust. Apart from these there remain difficulty and reward enough for the labours of exegesis.

² Klöpper's *Exeg-kritische Untersuchungen über den zweiten. Korintherbrief*, Götting. 1869, with the accompanying dissertation on the "Christ-party," appeared too late to be taken into consideration along with the other literature of the subject. But the dissertation in question belongs for the most part to the sphere of the *second* Epistle. It is from the second Epistle that it draws, more thoroughly and consistently than is done by Beyschlag, the characteristics of the Christ-party, combining these in such a way as to represent it as in fundamental opposition to the apostle's views and teaching with respect to Christology and Soteriology. I cannot, however, but continue to regard the process, which takes the traits for the delineation of the "Christ-party" from the *second* Epistle, as an unwarrantable one.—It was likewise impossible to include in my examination the just published book of Richard Schmidt, *die Paulinische Christologie in ihrem Zusammenhange mit der Heilslehre des Apostels*, Götting. 1870.

to agree with von Hofmann's work : *Die heilige Schrift neuen Testaments zusammenhängend untersucht*.¹ I have nowhere sought this antagonism, but it was as little my duty to evade or conceal it. Our exegetical natures are very differently constituted ; our paths diverge widely from each other, and the means which we have at our disposal, and which we deem it right to employ, are dissimilar. Possibly out of this very antagonism some advantage may accrue to the understanding of the New Testament.

HANNOVER, 30th November, 1869.

¹ This work is, for the sake of brevity, referred to merely by "Hofmann," other works of the author being more precisely designated by their title.

EXEGETICAL LITERATURE.

[For commentaries and collections of notes embracing the whole New Testament, see Preface to the Commentary on the Gospel of St. Matthew ; for those which treat of the Pauline or Apostolic Epistles generally, see Preface to the Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans. The following list includes only those which relate to the Epistles to the Corinthians (together or separately), or in which one of these Epistles holds the first place on the title-page. Works mainly of a popular and practical character have, with a few exceptions, been excluded, as, however valuable they may be in themselves, they have but little affinity with the strictly exegetical character of the present work. Monographs on chapters or sections are generally noticed by Meyer *in loc.* The editions quoted are usually the earliest ; *al.* appended denotes that the book has been more or less frequently reprinted ; † marks the date of the author's death ; *c. circa.*]

- AKERSLOOT (Theodorus), Reformed Minister in Holland : D'eerste Sendbrief van Paulus aan die van Korinthen, kortelyk in haar t'samenhang uytgelegt. 4^o, Lugd. Bat. 1707.
- ALPHEN (Hieronimus Simon van), † 1742, Prof. Theol. at Utrecht : Ontleedende verklaring van Paullus tweden brief aan die Corinther. 4^o, Amst. 1708, *al.*
- AMBROSIASTER. See ROMANS.
- BAUMGARTEN (Sigmund Jakob), † 1757, Prof. Theol. at Halle : Auslegung der beiden Briefe Pauli an die Corinther. 4^o, Halle, 1761.
- BILLROTH (Johann Gustav Friedrich), † 1836, Prof. at Halle : Commentar zu den Briefen des Paulus an die Korinther. 8^o, Leip. 1833.
[Translated by William Lindsay Alexander, D.D., 2 vols. 12^o, Edin. 1837-8.]
- BURGER (Karl Heinrich August von), Oberconsistorialrath at Munich : Der erste [*und der zweite*] Brief Pauli an die Korinther deutsch ausgelegt, 2 Bände. 8^o, Erlangen, 1859-60.
- COCCEIUS [KOCH] (Johann), † 1669, Prof. Theol. at Leyden : Commentarius in in Epistolas I. et II. ad Corinthios [Opera].
- CONTZEN (Adam), † 1635, Jesuit at Mentz : Commentaria in Epistolas S. Pauli ad Corinthios et ad Galatas. 2^o, Colon. 1631.
- CRELL (Johann), † 1633, Socinian teacher at Racow : Commentarius in priorem Pauli ad Corinthios Epistolam [Opera]. 8^o, Racov. 1635.
- EMMERLING (Christian August Gottfried), † 1827, Pastor at Probsthaida : Epistola Pauli ad Corinthios posterior, Graece, perpetuo commentario illustrata. 8^o, Lips. 1823.
- FLATT (Johann Friedrich von), † 1821, Prof. Theol. at Tübingen : Vorlesungen über die Briefe an die Corinther, herausgegeben von C. D. F. Hoffmann. 8^o, Tübing. 1827.
- FRITZSCHE (Karl Friedrich August), † 1846, Prof. Theol. at Rostock : De nonnullis posterioris Pauli ad Corinthios Epistolae locis dissertationes duae. 8^o, Lips. 1824.
- GRATAMA (Janus Aafeo) : Commentatio in Paulinae Epistolae prioris ad Corinthios caput vii. 8^o, Groning. 1846.

- HEYDENREICH (August Ludwig Christian), † c. 1856, Prof. at Herborn: *Commentarius in priorem D. Pauli ad Corinthios Epistolam*, 2 voll. 8^o, Marb. 1825-7.
- HODGE (Charles), D.D., Prof. Theol. at Princeton: *An exposition of the First Epistle to the Corinthians*. 8^o, Lond. 1857.
An exposition of the Second Epistle. 8^o, Lond. 1860.
- HOFMANN (Johann Christian Konrad von), Prof. Theol. at Erlangen: *Die Heilige Schrift Neuen Testaments zusammenhängend untersucht* (II. 2, 3 Briefe an die Korinther). 8^o, Nördlingen, 1864-6, *al*.
- JAEGER (C. F. Heinrich): *Erklärung der beiden Briefe des Apostel Paulus nach Corinth, aus dem Gesichtspunkte der vier Partheien daselbst*. 8^o, Tübing. 1838.
- KLING (Christian Friedrich), Dean of Marbach on the Neckar: *Die Korintherbriefe theologisch-homiletisch bearbeitet* [Lange's Bibelwerk, Theil. VII.]. 8^o, Bielefeld, 1861, *al*.
 [Translated with additions by Daniel W. Poor, D.D., and Conway B. Wing, D.D. 8^o, New York [and Edin.], 1869, *al*.]
- KLÖPPER (Albrecht), Tutor at Königsberg: *Exegetisch-kritische Untersuchungen über den zweiten Brief des Paulus an die Gemeinde zu Corinth*. 8^o, Götting. 1869.
Commentar über das zweite Sendschreiben. 8^o, Berl. 1874.
- KRAUSE (Friedrich August Wilhelm), † 1827, Private Tutor at Vienna: *Pauli ad Corinthios Epistolae Graece. Perpetua annotatione illustravit F. A. W. Krause. Vol. i. complectens ep. priorem*. 8^o, Francof. 1791.
- LEUN (Johann Georg Friedrich), † 1823, Pastor at Butzbach in Hesse: *Pauli ad Corinthios Epistola secunda Graece perpetua annotatione illustrata*. 8^o, Lemg. 1804.
- LIGHTFOOT (John), D.D., Master of Catherine Hall, Cambridge: *Horae Hebraicae et Talmudicae in Epistolam priorem ad Corinthios*. 4^o, Cantab. 1664.
- MAIER (Adalbert), R. C. Prof. Theol. at Freiburg: *Commentar über den ersten Brief Pauli an die Korinther*. 8^o, Freiburg, 1857.
- MAJOR [MAYER] (Georg), † 1574, Prof. Theol. at Wittenburg: *Enarratio Epistolarum Pauli ad Corinthios*. 8^o, Viteb. 1558, *al*.
- MARTYR (Peter) [VERMIGLI], † 1562, Prof. Theol. at Strassburg: *In priorem D. Pauli ad Corinthios Epistolam commentarii*. 2^o, Tiguri, 1551, *al*.
- MELANCHTHON (Philipp), † 1560, Reformer: *Brevis et utilis commentarius in priorem Epistolam Pauli ad Corinthios et in aliquot capita secundae*. 8^o, Vitemb. 1561, *al*.
- MOLDENHAUER (Johann Heinrich, Daniel), † 1790, Pastor at Hamburg: *Erster und zweiter Brief an die Corinther nach dem Grundtext übersetzt mit Erklärungen*. 8^o, Hamb. 1771-2.
- MORUS (Samuel Friedrich Nathanael), † 1792, Prof. Theol. at Leipzig: *Erklärung der beiden Briefe an die Corinther*. 8^o, Leip. 1794.
- MOSHEIM (Johann Lorenz von), † 1755, Chancellor and Professor Theol. at Göttingen: *Erklärung des ersten Briefes Pauli an die gemeine zu Corinthus*. 4^o, Altona, 1741.
Neue Ausgabe, nebst der Erklärung des zweiten Briefes herausgegeben von C. E. von Windheim, 2 Bände. 4^o, Altona u. Flensburg, 1762.
- MUSCULUS [MEUSSLIN] (Wolfgang), † 1563, Prof. Theol. at Bonn: *Commentarius in utramque Epistolam ad Corinthios*. 2^o, Basil, 1559, *al*.
- NEANDER (Johann August Wilhelm), † 1850, Prof. Theol. at Berlin: *Auslegung der beiden Briefe an die Corinther. Herausgegeben von Willib. Beyschlag*. 8^o, Berl. 1859.
- OSIANDER (J. Ernst), Dean at Göppingen in Württemberg: *Commentar über den ersten Brief Pauli an die Corinthier*. 8^o, Stuttgart, 1849.
Commentar über den zweiten Brief. 8^o, Stuttg. 1858.

- POTT (David Julius), † 1838, Prof. Theol. at Göttingen : Pauli Epistolae ad Corinthios Graece perpetua annotatione illustratae. [Novum Testamentum Koppianum, V. 1.] 8^o, Gotting. 1826.
- ROLLOCK (Robert), † 1598, Principal of University of Edinburgh : Commentarius in utramque Epistolam ad Corinthios, cum notis Jo. Piscatoris. 8^o, Herborn. 1600, *al.*
- RUCKERT (Leopold Immanuel), † c. 1845, Prof. Theol. at Jena : Commentar über die Briefe an die Corinther. 2 Bände. 8^o, Lips. 1836–7.
- SAHL (Laurids), † 1805, Prof. of Greek at Copenhagen : Paraphrasis in priorem Epistolam ad Corinthios. . . . 4^o, Hafn. 1778.
- SCHARLING (Carl Emil), Prof. Theol. at Copenhagen : Epistolam Pauli ad Corinthios posteriorem annotationibus in usum juvenum theolog. studiosorum illustravit C. E. Scharling. 8^o, Kopenh. 1840.
- SCHMID (Sebastian). See ROMANS.
- SCHULZE (Johann Christoph Friedrich), † 1806, Prof. Theol. at Giessen : Pauli erster Brief an die Korinther herausgegeben und erklärt.—Zweiter Brief erklärt . . . 8^o, Halle, 1784–5.
- SCLATER (William), D.D., † 1626, Vicar of Pitminster : Utriusque Epistolae ad Corinthios explicatio analyticae, una cum scholiis 4^o, Oxon. 1633.
- SEMLER (Johann Salomon), † 1791, Prof. Theol. at Halle : Paraphrasis in primam Pauli ad Corinthios Epistolam cum notis et Latinarum translationum excerptis. Et in secundam Epistolam . . . 12^o, Hal. 1770–6.
- STANLEY (Arthur Penrhyn), D.D., Dean of Westminster : The Epistles of St. Paul to the Corinthians ; with critical notes and dissertations. In two volumes. 8^o, Lond. 1855, *al.*
- STEVART (Peter), † 1621, Prof. Theol. at Ingolstadt : Commentaria in utramque Epistolam ad Corinthios. 4^o, Ingolstad. 1608.
- STORR (Gottlob Christian), † 1805, Consistorialrath at Stuttgart : Notitiae historicae Epistolarum Pauli ad Corinthios interpretationi servientes. 4^o, Tübing. 1788.
- TIL (Salomon van), † 1713, Prof. Theol. at Leyden : Kortbondige verklaring ouer den eersten Brief van Paulus aan die van Korinthen. 4^o, Amst. 1731.
- [See also ROMANS.]
- VITRINGA (Kempe), † 1722, Prof. Theol. at Franeker : Exercitationes in difficiliora loca prioris Epistolae Pauli ad Corinthios. 4^o, Franeq. 1784–9.
- WINDHEIM (Christian Ernst von). See MOSHEIM (Johann Lorenz).
- ZACHARIAE (Gotthilf Trangott), † 1777, Prof. Theol. at Kiel : Paraphrastische Erklärung der beiden Briefe an die Corinther, mit vielen Ammerkungen herausgegeben von J. K. Vollborth. 2 Bände. 8^o, Götting. 1784–5.

To the foregoing list may be added :

- D. W. POOR, Translation and Enlargement of Kling's Exposition of the First Ep., in Lange's Com. New York, 1868.
- C. P. WING, Translation and Enlargement of Kling's Exposition of the Second Ep., in Lange's Com. Ibid.
- CANON EVANS, Com. on First Ep. in Bible Com. Lond. 1881.
- JOSEPH WAITE, Com. on Second Ep. in Bible Com. Lond. 1881.
- T. T. SHORE, on First Ep. in Ellicott's Com. Lond. 1880.
- E. H. PLUMPTRE, on Second in Ellicott's Com. Lond. 1880.
- DAVID BROWN, on both Epistles in Schaff's Popular Com. on N. T. New York, 1882.
- JOSEPH AGAR BEET, Com. on both Epistles. Lond. 1882.

ABBREVIATIONS.

al., *et al.* = and others ; and other passages ; and other editions.

ad. or *in loc.* refers to the note of the commentator or editor named on the particular passage.

comp. = compare. "Comp. on Matt. iii. 5" refers to Dr. Meyer's own commentary on the passage. So also "See on Matt. iii. 5."

codd. = codices or manuscripts. The uncial manuscripts are denoted by the usual letters, the Sinaitic by *Σ*.

min. = codices *minusculi*, manuscripts in cursive writing. Where these are individually quoted, they are marked by the usual Arabic numerals, as 33, 89.

Rec. or *Recepta* = *Textus receptus*, or *lectio recepta* (Elzevir).

l.c. = *loco citato* or *laudato*.

ver. = verse, *vv.* = verses.

f. ff. = and following. *Ver. 16 f.* means verses 16 and 17. *vv. 16 ff.* means verses 16 and two or more following.

vss. = versions. These, when individually referred to, are marked by the usual abridged forms. *E.g.* *Syr.* = *Peshitto Syriac* ; *Syr. p.* = *Philoxenian Syriac*.

p. pp. = page, pages.

e.g. = *exempli gratia*.

sc. = *scilicet*.

N. T. = *New Testament*. *O. T.* = *Old Testament*.

κ.τ.λ. = *καὶ τὰ λοιπά*.

The colon (:) is largely employed, as in the German, to mark the point at which a translation or paraphrase of a passage is introduced, or the transition to the statement of another's opinions.

. . . . indicates that words are omitted.

The books of Scripture and of the Apocrypha are generally quoted by their usual English names and abbreviations. *Ecclus.* = *Ecclesiasticus*. 3 *Esd.*, 4 *Esd.* (or *Esr.*) = the books usually termed 1st and 2d *Esdras*.

The classical authors are quoted in the usual abridged forms by book, chapter, etc. (as *Xen. Anab. vi. 6, 12*) or by the paging of the edition generally used for that purpose (as *Plat. Pol. p. 291 B.* of the edition of H. Stephanus). The names of the works quoted are printed in *Italics*. Roman numerals in small letters are used to denote books or other internal divisions (as *Thuc. iv.*) ; Roman numerals in capitals denote volumes (as *Kühner, II.*).

The references to Winer's or to Buttman's *Grammàr*, given in brackets thus [*E. T. 152*], apply to the corresponding pages of Dr. Moulton's and Prof. Thayer's English translations respectively.

THE
FIRST EPISTLE OF PAUL TO THE CORINTHIANS.

INTRODUCTION.

SEC. 1.—THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH AT CORINTH.

IN Corinth (*bimaris Corinthus*), which, after its destruction by Mummius (146 B.C.), had been rebuilt by Julius Cæsar, made a Roman colony (Pausan. ii. 1. 2), and under the fostering care of the first emperors had been speedily restored to its ancient (see Hom. *Il.* ii. 570, and especially Pindar, *Ol.* xiii.) glory and voluptuous luxury (hence the expressions *κορινθιάζεσθαι*, *κορινθιαστής*; and *Κορινθία κόρη*; see also Dissen, *ad Pind. Fragm.* p. 640 f.; Ast, *ad Plat. Rep.* p. 404 D),—in that great *Ἑλλάδος ἄστρον* (Jacobs, *ad Anthol.* VI. p. 223), that rich commercial city, the seat of the Roman proconsulate, of the Isthmian games, of the fine arts, and of the learning of the Sophists, but also of the most shameless worship of Aphrodite carried on by a thousand consecrated courtesans,—the world-conquering faith of Christ had been planted by *Paul himself* (iii. 6). He came thither on his second missionary journey from Athens, and spent upwards of a year and a half there (see on Acts xviii. 1–17). He lodged with his fellow-craftsman Aquila, who was converted by him here (see on Acts xviii. 1, 2), and subsequently with the proselyte Justus (Acts xviii. 2–7), after his friends Silas and Timotheus had arrived (Acts xviii. 5), and Jewish opposition had caused him to separate from the synagogue and turn to the Gentiles (Acts xviii. 6 ff.). This had the wholesome result of rendering the church, from the very first, a *mixed* (though with a majority of *Gentile* Christians, Acts xii. 2) and a *very numerous* one (Acts xviii. 4, 8, 10), the most important in Greece, the mother-church of the province (i. 2), although only a few of the upper and more cultivated classes (1 Cor. i. 26 ff.) embraced the faith (such as, on the Jewish side, the president of the synagogue, Crispus; see Acts xviii. 8; 1 Cor. i. 14),—a natural effect, not so much of the simplicity of Paul's preaching¹

¹ Rückert, following Neander (comp. also Osiander, p. 6), thinks that the failure of the apostle's attempt at Athens to gain entrance for evangelical truth by associating

it with Hellenic forms (Acts xvii.), had led him to the resolution of giving up every such attempt, and of proclaiming the gospel among the Greeks also in its entire sim-

(for Apollos also failed to win over the higher classes), as of the intrinsic character of the gospel itself (i. 22, 23), which, with its preaching of the cross, did not suit the pretensions of the presumed higher culture among Jews and Gentiles, especially of their fancied philosophy and of their moral laxity.¹

Some considerable time after the total failure of a public accusation brought by the Jews against Paul before the mild proconsul Gallio (see on Acts xviii. 12–17), the apostle departed from Corinth with Aquila and Priscilla (whom he left in Ephesus), and proceeded to Jerusalem, and thence through Galatia and Phrygia (Acts xviii. 18–23). While he, however, was traversing these countries, *Apollos*—an eloquent and fervid Jew of Alexandria, who, hitherto merely a disciple of John the Baptist, had completed his Christian training with Aquila and Priscilla at Ephesus (Acts xviii. 24 ff., and the commentary thereon)—betook himself to Corinth (Acts xix. 1), where he, as a Pauline Christian, preached no other than Pauline Christianity (1 Cor. iii. 6), yet presented it in a different *form*, deviating with the art of his Alexandrian eloquence and with his employment of Alexandrian (Philonian) speculation, from the simple manner of the apostle (i. 17, ii.), probably also entering further than Paul had done (iii. 1) into several of the higher doctrines of Christianity. Now, it is easy to understand how this difference, although certainly not based upon any divergence in doctrine (iii. 5 f., iv. 6, xvi. 12), nevertheless, from the variety of individual tendencies among the Corinthians, and from the personal respect and love with which men clung to the old or the new teacher respectively, came to have the hurtful result that some, amidst mutual jealousy, assigned the higher place to the former and some to the latter, and that it gradually became a *point of partisanship* with them to call themselves adherents of Paul or of Apollos (i. 12),—which was not carried out without engendering pride and irritation, to the prejudice of the two teachers in question.

But the matter did not end with this division into two parties. There arrived at Corinth—taking advantage, perhaps, of the very time of Apollos' return to Ephesus—Judaizing teachers, *Petrine* Christians of *anti-Pauline*

plicity. But the fact is, that in Athens Paul was in the *quite peculiar* position of having to speak in presence of philosophers by profession, and, in the first instance, to them exclusively. In Corinth, on the other hand, in the house of the proselyte Justus, it was at all events a very mixed audience (made up also of Jews and Gentiles, comp. Acts xviii. 8) that he had before him, one entirely different from those Stoics and Epicureans who laid hold of him in the *áγopά* at Athens. The Athenian address is therefore to be regarded as an *exception* from his usual mode of teaching, demanded by the special circumstances of the case. These circumstances, however, did not exist at Corinth, and accordingly he had no occasion there to teach in any other way than his ordinary

one. Before his mixed audience in Corinth (and he could not regulate his course by the possible presence of individual philosophers among them) his preaching, simple, but full of power and fervour, was thoroughly fitted to make converts in numbers, as the result proved. And if these were for the most part from the humbler ranks, Paul was the last man to be led by that circumstance to adopt a higher tone; for he knew from long experience among what classes in society Christianity was wont everywhere to strike its first and firmest roots.

¹ Comp. generally, Semisch, *Paulus in Corinth*, in the *Jahrb. für Deutsche Theol.* 1867, p. 193 ff.

leanings, provided with letters of recommendation (2 Cor. iii. 1), perhaps from Peter himself among others, labouring to lower the authority of Paul (ix. 2), into whose field of work they intruded, and to exalt the authority of Peter (2 Cor. xi. 5). They seem, indeed, not to have come forward with any opposition to Paul's *doctrine*, for otherwise the apostle would, as in his Epistle to the Galatians, have controverted their doctrinal errors; in particular, they did not insist upon circumcision. But it was natural that, with their Judaizing tendencies generally, with their legal prejudice regarding the use of meats, with their stringency as to the moral law, and with their exaltation of Peter at the expense of Paul, they should find acceptance with the Jewish-Christian part of the community, since they were not slack in vainglorious assertion of the national privileges (2 Cor. v. 12, xi. 22, xii. 11), and that against the *very* man from whom the hereditary pride of the Jews had everywhere suffered blows which it felt most keenly. Equally natural was it that their appearance and operations should not induce a union between the two sections that professed Pauline Christianity,—the adherents of Paul and of Apollos,—seeing that they had to wage war only against *Paul*, and not against Apollos, in so far, namely, as apostolic authority was claimed for the former only, and not for the latter. The declared adherents, whom they met with, named as their head *Peter*, who, for that matter, had never himself been in Corinth; for the statement of Dionysius of Corinth in Euseb. ii. 25, is either to be referred to a much later period (Ewald, *Gesch. der apost. Zeit.* p. 609, 3d ed.), or, as is most probable, to be regarded simply as an erroneous inference drawn from 1 Cor. i. 12. See Pott, *Proleg.* p. 20 f.; Baur in the *Tübing. Zeitschr.* 1831, 4, p. 152 ff.

The addition of a third party to the two already existing aroused a deeper feeling of the need for wholly disregarding that which had brought about and kept up all this division into parties,—the authority of men,—and for returning to Him alone who is the Master of all, namely, to Christ.¹

“*We belong to Christ*” became accordingly the watchword, unhappily, however, not of all, nor yet in its right sense and application, but, on the contrary, of a section only; and these followed out their idea,—which was in itself right, but which should have been combined with the recognition of the human instruments of Christ (Paul, etc.),—not in the way of themselves keeping clear of schismatic proceedings and acknowledging all as, like themselves, disciples of Christ, but in such a manner that in their professed sanctity and lofty abstinence from partisanship they became themselves a party (i. 12), and instead of including the whole community—without prejudice to the estimation due to such servants of Christ as Paul and others—in their idea, they shut out from it the Pauline, Apollonian, and Petrine sections. The Christian community at Corinth, then, was in this state of *fourfold* division when Paul wrote to them our first Epistle; yet it is to be assumed, from xi. 18, xiv. 23, that the evil had not reached

¹ Augustine aptly says, *De verb. Dom.*, *Serm.* 13: “Volentes homines aedificari super homines, dicebant: Ego quidem sum

Pauli, etc. Et alii, qui nolebant aedificari super Petrum, sed super petram: Ego autem sum, Christi.”

such a height of schism that the church no longer assembled at *one place* (in opposition to Vitranga, Michaelis, Eichhorn, Ewald, and others ; see on i. 2).

What further knowledge we have regarding the condition of the church at that time, especially as to the moral and ecclesiastical evils that prevailed, is derived from the contents of the Epistle itself. See § 2.

REMARK 1.—For views differing from the above representation of the parties at Corinth, see on i. 12. To the more recent literature of the subject, besides the works on Introduction, belong the following : Neander, *Kl. Schrift.* p. 68 ff., and *Gesch. d. Pflanzung*, etc., I. p. 360 ff., 4th ed. ; Baur in the *Tüb. Zeitschr.* 1831, p. 61 ff., 1836, 4, p. 1 ff., and in his *Paulus*, I. p. 290 ff., 2d ed. ; Scharling, *De Paulo apost. ejusque adversariis*, Kopenh. 1836 ; Jaeger, *Erkl. d. Briefe P. nach Kor. aus d. Gesichtsp. d. vier Parth.* Tüb. 1838 ; Schenkel, *De eccles. Cor. primaeva factionibus turbata*, Basil. 1838 ; Goldhorn in Illgen's *Zeitschr. f. histor. Theol.* 1840, 2, p. 121 ff. ; Dähne, *d. Christus-parthei in d. apost. Kirche z. Kor.*, Halle 1842 (previously in the *Journ. f. Pred.* 1841) ; Kniewel, *Ecclesiae Cor. vetustiss. dissensiones et turbae*, Gedan. 1841 ; Becker, *d. Partheiungen in d. Gem. z. Kor.*, Altona 1842 ; Rübiger, *krit. Untersuchungen üb. d. Inhalt d. beid. Br. an d. Kor.*, Bresl. 1847 ; Lutterbeck, *neutest. Lehrbegr.* II. p. 45 ff. ; Beyschlag in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1865, p. 217 ff. ; Hilgenfeld in his *Zeitschr.* 1865, p. 241 ff. ; Holtzmann in Herzog's *Encykl.* XIX. p. 730 ff. ; comp. also Ewald, *Gesch. d. apost. Zeit.* p. 505 ff., 3d ed. Among the latest commentaries, see especially those of Osiander, Stuttg. 1847, *Introd.* § 4 ; Ewald, p. 102 f. ; Hofmann, 1864.

REMARK 2.—Care should be taken not to push the conception of this division into parties too far. As it had only recently arisen, it had not yet made itself felt to such an extent as to induce the church in their letter to Paul (see § 2) to write specifically about it (see i. 11). Nor can the dissensions have been of long continuance ; at least in Clem. 1 *Cor.* 47, they appear as something long past and gone, with which Clement compares later quarrels as something worse.

REMARK 3.—Only the first part of our Epistle, down to iv. 21, relates to the topic of the parties as such. Hence it is a very hazardous course, and one that requires great caution, to refer the further points discussed by Paul to the different parties respectively, and to characterize these accordingly, as Jaeger and Rübiger more especially, but also Baur, Hilgenfeld, Ewald, Beyschlag, and others have done to an extent which cannot be made good on historical grounds. It is purely and grossly arbitrary to trace all the evils combated in both Epistles to the existence of the party divisions, and to depict these, and more particularly the Christine section, accordingly. The latter is not once mentioned by Clement,—a circumstance which does not tell in favour of the hypothesis that lays so much mischief to its charge.

SEC. 2.—OCCASION, OBJECT, AND CONTENTS OF THE EPISTLE.

Before the date of our first Epistle there had been a letter—not now extant¹—sent from the apostle to the Corinthians (1 *Cor.* v. 9) ; but when

¹ The two quite short Epistles extant in Armenian, from the Corinthians to Paul and from Paul to the Corinthians, are wretched apocryphal productions (first published by

Phil. Masson in Joh. Masson, *Histoire crit. de la républ. des lettres*, vol. X., 1714 ; then by David Wilkins, 1715 ; by Whiston, 1727, and his sons, 1736 ; by Carpzov, Lips. 1776 ;

he wrote it, the party-divisions were not yet known to the apostle. He received tidings regarding them from “those of the household of Chloe” (i. 11), and on this account commissioned Timothy to visit Corinth (iv. 17), although our Epistle was to anticipate his arrival there (xvi. 10), since he had first to journey through Macedonia with Erastus (Acts xix. 22). That Apollos also (1 Cor. xvi. 12) had brought Paul information about the divisions is—judging from i. 11—not to be assumed; on the contrary, it seems probable that they had not perceptibly developed themselves so long as Apollos himself remained in Corinth. Next to the vexatious party-divisions, however, what gave occasion for the apostle’s letter was the unchastity in the church, already spoken of by him in the lost Epistle, and which had now manifested itself even in a case of incest (v. 1 ff.). Besides this and other evils that called for his intervention, there was quite a special and direct occasion for his writing in a letter of the church (vii. 1), brought to Paul by deputies from Corinth (xvi. 17), and containing various questions (such as with respect to celibacy, vii. 1 ff., and the eating of flesh offered in sacrifice, viii. 1 ff.), which demanded an answer from him,¹ so that he made the messengers—Stephanas, Fortunatus, and Achaicus—on their return the bearers of his own Epistle in reply (xvi. 12, 17).

In accordance with these circumstances giving occasion to the letter, it was the *aim* of Paul, first, to counteract the party-divisions and uphold his apostolic authority; secondly, to remove the unchastity which had gained ground; thirdly, to give instruction upon the points regarding which queries had been put to him; and finally, to communicate various other instructions, which, in view of the state of things among the Corinthians which had come to his knowledge, and partly also in view of the express contents of their letter, seemed to him necessary and useful, such as with respect to disorder in the public assemblies, with respect to gifts of the Spirit, with respect to the resurrection, and with respect to a collection that was to be set on foot.²

The *contents* of the Epistle are accordingly very diversified. After salutation and exordium (i. 1–9), the first main section enlarges upon and against

and in Armenian and English by Aucher, *Armenian Grammar*, etc., Venet. 1819; see also Fabric. *Cod. Apocr.* III. p. 667 ff.). Rinck, indeed, has recently (in opposition to the *earlier* defence by Whiston, see the objections urged by Carpzov) sought to maintain the genuineness of both Epistles (*das Sendschr. d. Kor. an d. Apost. Paul. u. das dritte Sendschr. Pauli an die Kor. in Armen. Uebersetzung, neu verdeutscht*, etc., Heidelb. 1823), and that on the footing of holding the apostle’s letter not to be the one mentioned in v. 9, but a later third Epistle. But against this utterly fruitless attempt, see Ullmann, *über den durch Rinck bekannt gemachten dritten Brief an d. Kor. und das kurze Sendschreiben der Kor.* in the *Heidelb. Jahrb.* 1823; Bengel, *Archiv.* 1825,

p. 287 ff. Regarding the date of the composition of the lost Epistle, see Wieseler, *Chronologie des apost. Zeitalt.* p. 318.

¹ That this letter from the church was marked by a tone of confidence and pride of knowledge (Hofmann) cannot, with any certainty, be inferred from our Epistle, the many humbling rebukes in which bear upon the evils themselves, not upon that letter and its character.

² Observe that, in connection with these different topics, Paul never makes the teachers as such responsible, or gives directions to them,—a proof that he was far from cherishing the idea of a divinely instituted order of teachers. Comp. Höfling, *Grundsätze d. Kirchenverf.* p. 279 f., ed. 3.

the party-divisions, with a detailed justification of the apostle's mode of teaching (i. 10–iv. 21). Then Paul writes regarding the unchastity in the church (v.), and regarding the bad habit of having their disputes decided before heathen tribunals, thereafter once more warning them against impurity (vi.). Next he replies to the questions about marriage which had been sent to him (vii.), and to the inquiry regarding meat used in sacrifice (viii.–xi. 1), making in connection with his instructions as to the latter point a digression regarding the unselfish way in which he had discharged his apostolic office (ix.). Then follow censure and admonition as to disorders in the assemblies of the church, partly with reference to the head-covering of the women, partly in regard of the love-feasts (xi.) ; then the detailed sections respecting spiritual gifts (xii.–xiv.), with the magnificent eulogy on love (xiii.), and respecting the resurrection of the dead (xv.). Lastly : injunctions about the collection for Jerusalem, miscellaneous remarks, and greetings (xvi.).

It is manifest from the salutation, when rightly understood, *that the Epistle was destined for the whole church at Corinth*, without excepting any party whatsoever, but including the rest of the Christians of Achaia.

SEC. 3.—PLACE AND TIME OF COMPOSITION—GENUINENESS OF THE EPISTLE.

From xvi. 8, 19 it is certain that Paul wrote *in Ephesus*,¹ and that towards the end of his stay in that place, which did not last quite three years (see on Acts xix. 10), after he had despatched (Acts xix. 22 ; 1 Cor. iv. 17) Timothy and Erastus to Macedonia (the former to Corinth as well), and had already resolved to journey through Macedonia and Achaia to Jerusalem (Acts xix. 21 ; 1 Cor. xvi. 3 ff.). The *time* at which he wrote may be gathered from xvi. 8 (some time before Pentecost) and v. 6–8, from which latter passage it may be with reason inferred that, when Paul was writing, the feast of the Passover was nigh at hand. Consequently : *a little before Easter in the year 58* (see *Introd. to Acts*, § 4).

REMARK 1.—The statement in the common subscription *ἐγράφη ἀπὸ Φιλίππων* is an old (already in Syr.) and widespread error, arising from xvi. 5. In reply to the quite untenable grounds urged by Köhler (*Abfassungszeit der epistol. Schriften*, p. 74 ff.), who accepts it, and puts the date of composition after the (erroneously assumed) liberation from imprisonment at Rome, see Anger, *temp. rat.* p. 53 ff. Comp. Rückert, p. 12 ff. ; Wurm in the *Tüb. Zeitschr.* 1838, I. p. 63 ff. The correct subscription is found in B**, Copt. Chrys. Euthal. Theodoret, *al.* : *πρὸς Κορ. α ἐγράφη ἀπὸ Ἐφέσου*.

REMARK 2.—The decision of the question, whether Paul, previous to the writing of our two Epistles, had been only *once*, or whether he had been *twice*,

¹ Mill and Haenlein strangely took it to mean : not *in*, but *near* Ephesus, because Paul, in xvi. 8, did not write *ἐν* in place of *ἐν* Ἐφ. ! Böttger also (*Beiträge zur hist. krit. Einl. in die Paul. Br.*, Götting. 1837, III.

p. 30) avails himself of this circumstance in support of his hypothesis, that the Epistle was written in *Southern Achaia*. See, against this, Rückert, *Magaz. f. Exeg.* I. p. 132 ff.

in Corinth (so rightly Bleek in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1830, p. 614 ff., and in his *Introduction* ; Schrader, I. p. 95 ff. ; Neander, Billroth, Rückert, Anger, Credner, Schott, Wurm, Olshausen, Wieseler, Reuss, Ewald, and many others, following Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Baronius, *et al.*), as also whether we must assume a second visit *between* our first and second Epistles, depends on 2 Cor. ii. 1, xii. 14, 21, xiii. 1, 2. See the particulars in the Introd. to 2 Cor. § 2.

As to the *genuineness*, there is no room for doubt in view of the external evidences (Polyc. *ad Philipp.* 11 ; Ignat. *ad Eph.* 2 ; Clem. Rom. *ad Cor.* i. 47, 49, *Epist. ad Diogn.* 12—Justin M. c. *Tryph.* pp. 253, 258, 338, *Apol.* I. p. 29 are uncertain—Iren. *Haer.* iii. 11. 9, iv. 27. 3 ; Athenag. *de resurr.* p. 61, ed. Colon. ; Clem. Al. *Paedag.* p. 96, ed. Sylb. ; *Canon Murator.* ; Tertull. *de praescrip.* 33, *al.*), and from the whole character of the Epistle (see especially Paley, *Horae Paulinae*), which, with all the variety of its subject-matter, bears the most definite impress of the peculiar spirit and tact of Paul, and displays the full power, art, and subtlety of his eloquence. Bruno Bauer alone in his wanton fashion has sought to dispute it (*Kritik der Paulin. Briefe*, II., Berl. 1851).

Παύλου πρὸς Κορινθίους ἐπιστολὴ πρώτη.

The simplest and probably oldest superscription is that of A B C D⁸, min. : πρὸς Κορινθίους πρώτη.

CHAPTER I.

Ver. 1. κλητός] is wanting, indeed, in A D E, Clar. Germ. Cyr. (suspected by Mill and Griesb., bracketed by Lachm., deleted by Rückert), but was easily overlooked by those to whom the fact was known and familiar, that Paul in the beginning of his Epistles almost invariably styles himself ἀπόστ. 'I. X. διὰ θελ. Θεοῦ without κλητός; see 2 Cor. i. 1; Eph. i. 1; Col. i. 1; 2 Tim. i. 1. Comp. also Gal. i. 1; 1 Tim. i. 1; Tit. i. 1; only in Rom. i. 1 we find κλητός. — Instead of 'Ιησοῦ Χριστοῦ, read, on preponderant evidence, with Lachm. and Tisch. Χριστοῦ 'Ιησοῦ. — Ver. 2 τῇ οὔσῃ ἐν Κορ.] is placed by B D* E F G, It. after 'Ιησοῦ; so Lachm. and Tisch. No doubt rightly, since the common arrangement of the words is plainly open to the suspicion of transposition on grounds of grammar, whereas there is no reason why, if it stood so originally, it should have undergone alteration. The hypothesis of Fritzsche, *de conformat*, N. T. Lachm. 1841, p. 44, that ἡγιασμ. ἐν X. 'I. had been left out, and then reinserted in the wrong place, is an arbitrary one, considering the weight of evidence on Lachmann's side and seeing that the right place for the reinsertion would have been so unmistakable. — τε καί] Lachm. : καί, according to B D G⁸. But how easily τε might be dropped without its being noticed! — Ver. 14. Rückert has μου after Θεῷ, in accordance with A, 17, 57, *al.* and several vss. and Fathers. An addition from ver. 4. — Ver. 15. ἐβάπτισα] A B C*⁸, min. and several vss. and Fathers have ἐβάπτισθητε; so Lachm. Rück. and Tisch. Rightly; the immediate context in vv. 14, 16 led to the introduction of the active at a very early date (Syr. Tert.). — Ver. 20. τούτου after κόσμον is wanting in very important witnesses. Deleted by Lachm. Tisch. and Rückert. A mechanical addition from the foregoing. — Ver. 22. σημεῖον] σημεία, adopted by Griesb. Lachm. Rück. Tisch. Scholz. is so decisively attested by A B C D E F G⁸, min. and many vss. and Fathers, that we must regard the singular as introduced through the recollection of Matt. xii. 38 f., xvi. 4, *al.* The reading ἐπιζητούντων in A points in the same direction. See the detailed justification of the plur. in Reiche, *Commentar. crit.* I. p. 121 ff. — Ver. 23. ἐθνεσι] Elz. : ἔλλησι, against decisive evidence. Noted on margin, and then adopted in accordance with what goes before and follows. — Ver. 28. Before τὰ μὴ ὄντα Elz. has καί, against preponderant testimony. Suspected by Griesb.; deleted by Lachm. Scholz, Rück. and Tisch. Mechanical connection. — Ver. 29. τοῦ Θεοῦ] So Griesb. and all later editors, following decisive evidence. Αὐτοῦ in Elz. is an over-hasty correction, due to a failure to recognize the design of the repetition of τ. Θεοῦ. — Ver. 30. σοφία ἡμῶν] Approved by Griesb. adopted also by Lachm. Rück. and Tisch. Elz. and Scholz, however, have ἡμῶν σοφία. For the former order are A C D E⁸, min. Vulg. ms. It.

Harl.** Or. Eus. *al.*, further, B, which has σοφ. ἡμῶν, and F G, which have ἡ σοφία ἡμῶν. Ἡμῶν was put first, in order to join σοφία closely to ἀπὸ Θεοῦ; while others marked the conception of the *true* wisdom by the article (F G).

Vv. 1-3. *Apostolic address and greeting.*

Ver. 1. Κλητὸς ἀπόστ. See on Rom. i. 1. A polemical reference (Chrysostom, Theophylact, and many others, including Flatt, Rückert, Olshausen, Osiander), which would be foreign to the winning tone of the whole exordium, would have been quite otherwise expressed by one so decided as Paul (comp. Gal. i. 1). — διὰ θελ. Θεοῦ] That his position as an apostle called by Christ was brought about *by the will of God*, was a truth so vividly and firmly implanted in his consciousness, that he commonly includes an expression of it in the beginning of his Epistles. See 2 Cor. i. 1; Gal. i. 1; Eph. i. 1; Col. i. 1; 1 Tim. i. 1; 2 Tim. i. 1. “Sua ipsius voluntate P. nunquam factus esset apostolus,” Bengel. Regarding διὰ, see on ver. 9 and Gal. i. 1. — καὶ Σωσθένης] Modern interpreters reckon him the *amanuensis* of the Epistle (see xvi. 21). But the mere *amanuensis as such* has no share in the Epistle itself, which must, however, be the case with one who holds a place in the introductory salutation. Since, moreover, in 1 and 2 Thess. we find *two* others besides Paul named with him in the superscription (who therefore *could* hardly both be mentioned as *amanuenses*), and even an indefinite number of “brethren” in the Epistle to the Galatians, whereas in that to the Romans the *amanuensis*—who is known from xvi. 22—does *not* appear as included in the superscription, we must rather suppose that *Paul made his Epistle run not only in his own name, but also* (although, of course, in a subordinate sense) *in the name of Sosthenes*, so that the Corinthians were to regard the letter of the apostle as at the same time a letter of Sosthenes, who thereby signified his desire to impress upon them the same doctrines, admonitions, etc. This presupposes that Paul had previously considered and discussed with this friend of his the contents of the letter to be issued. Comp. on Phil. i. 1. Sosthenes himself accordingly appears as a teacher then present with the apostle and enjoying his confidence, but known to, and respected among, the Corinthians. There remains, indeed, the *possibility* that he may have also *written* the Epistle, but only in so far as we are *in utter ignorance* of who the *amanuensis* was at all. Had *Timothy* not already started on his journey (iv. 17, xvi. 10), he would have had a place along with, or instead of, Sosthenes in the salutation of the Epistle; comp. 2 Cor. i. 1. — Theodoret and most commentators, including Flatt, Billroth, Ewald, Maier, Hofmann, indentify Sosthenes with the person so named in Acts xviii. 17; but this is rightly denied by Michaelis, Pott, Rückert, and de Wette. See on Acts, *l.c.* Without due ground, Rückert concludes that he was a *young* man trained up by Paul—a view least of all to be deduced from the assumption that he was the *amanuensis* of the letter. The very absence of any definite information whatever as to Sosthenes shows how utterly arbitrary is the remark of Chrysostom, Theophylact, Grotius, and Estius, that it was a great proof of *modesty* in the apostle to name him along with himself. — ὁ ἀδελφός] denotes nothing more special than *Chris-*

tian brotherhood (so also 2 Cor. i. 1 ; Col. i. 1, *al.*), not fellowship in the office of teacher. The *particulars* of the position of Sosthenes were well known to the readers.

Ver. 2. Τῇ ἐκκλ. τ. Θεοῦ] Θεοῦ is genitive of the owner. Comp. קהל יהוה, Num. xvi. 3, xx. 4. The expression is with Paul the standing theocratic designation of the Christian community, in which the theocratic idea of the Old Testament קהל presents itself as realized ; it is the πλήρωσις of this קהל. Comp. x. 32, xi. 16, 22, xv. 9 ; 2 Cor. i. 1 ; Gal. i. 13, *al.* — ἡγιασμ. ἐν Χ. 'Ι.] adds at once a distinctive definition of quality to τ. ἐκκλ. τ. Θεοῦ (see the critical remarks), and thereupon follows the local specification of τ. ἐκκλ. τ. Θεοῦ. “*To the church of God, men sanctified in Christ Jesus, which is in Corinth.*” How common it is to find a participle in the *plural* standing in an attributive relation to a collective *singular*, may be seen in Kühner, II. p. 43 ; Pflugk, *ad Eur. Hec.* 39. Τῇ οὔσῃ ἐν Κορ., however, is *purposely* placed *after* ἡγιασμ. κ.τ.λ., because the thought is, that the church of God addressed does in itself and as such (not as *Corinthian*) consist of those sanctified in Christ. The ἀγιασμός is to be conceived as *consecration to God in the Christian church* (see above, τ. ἐκκλ. τ. Θεοῦ). Comp. on Rom. i. 7. This belonging to God as *His own* has its causal ground not out of, but *in Christ*—namely, in His redemptive work, of which the Christians have become, and continue to be, partakers (*perfect*) by means of justifying faith (Eph. i. 4 ff. ; Heb. x. 10). Comp. Phil. i. 1. 'Εν Χ. 'Ι. gives to the ἡγιασμ. its *distinctively Christian character*.¹ — κλητοῖς ἀγίοις] added, in order to a properly exhaustive description of that experienced benefit of God's grace of which the readers, as Christians, were assumed to be conscious ; the new element introduced here lies in κλητοῖς. The *call to the Messianic kingdom* (conceived as issued *effectually*, comp. on Rom. viii. 28, and see Lamping, *Pauli de predestin. decreta*, Leovard. 1858, p. 32 f.) is, according to the constant conception of the N. T. (Rom. i. 6 ; Gal. i. 6 not excepted), given by *God* (ver. 9, Rom. viii. 30, ix. 24, *al.* ; Usteri, *Lehrbegr.* p. 281) through the preachers of the gospel (Rom. x. 14 ; 2 Thess. ii. 14) ; see Weiss, *bibl. Theol.* p. 386 f. — σὺν πᾶσι κ.τ.λ.] does not belong to κλητοῖς ἀγίοις, so that the readers were to be made sensible of the greatness of the *fellowship in which they, as called saints, stood* (Grotius, Bengel, Storr, Rosenmüller, Flatt, Billroth, Rückert, Olshausen, de Wette, Neander, Becker, Hofmann). But it belongs, as necessarily follows from 2 Cor. i. 1, to the *superscription as part of it* (on σὺν, comp. Phil. i. 1) ; yet neither so as to mark the Epistle as a *catholic one* (Theodoret, Estius, Calovius, Cornelius à Lapide, and others ; comp. Schrader) ; nor so that Paul shall be held, while greeting the Corinthians, as greeting in spirit also the *universal church* (Osiander, comp. Chrysostom, Theodoret, Erasmus, Billroth, Heydenreich, and others) ; nor yet so that by the ἐπικαλ. τ. ὄν. τ. Κυρ. were meant the *separatists*, in contrast to those disposed to adhere to the church (Vitranga, Michaelis), or as if σὺν πᾶσι κ.τ.λ. were meant to *comprehend all Corinthian Christians without dis-*

¹ [It also shows that the sanctification comes by virtue of union with Christ, ac-

cording to the standing force of the phrase *in Christ* as used by Paul.—T. W. C.]

inction (Eichhorn, *Einleit.* III. 1, p. 110, Pott) ; but so that the sense is in substance just that expressed in 2 Cor. i. 1 : *σὺν τοῖς ἁγίοις πᾶσι τοῖς οὖσιν ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ Ἀχαΐᾳ*. See below on *αὐτῶν τε καὶ ἡμῶν*. The Epistle is primarily addressed to the Christians in Corinth ; not, however, to them *merely*, but *at the same time also to the other Achaean Christians*, and the latter are denoted by *πᾶσι . . . ἡμῶν*. A comma is to be put after *ἁγίοις*. — *τοῖς ἐπικαλ. τ. ὄν τ. Κυρ.*] confessional designation of the Christians, Rom. x. 12 f. ; Acts ii. 21. Respecting the N. T. idea of the *invocation of Christ*, which is not to be held as absolute, but as *relative* worship¹ (of Him as the Mediator and Lord over all, but under God, Phil. ii. 10 f.), see on Rom. x. 12. — *αὐτῶν τε καὶ ἡμῶν*] is joined with *τοῦ Κυρίου* by Chrysostom, Theodoret, Photius, Theophylact, Calvin, Beza, Piscator, Erasmus Schmid, Valekenauer, and others, including Billroth, Olshausen, Lücke (*de invocat. Chr.*, Götting. 1843), Wieseler (*Chronol. des apost. Zeitalt.* p. 324), in such a way as to make it an epanorthosis or (see Wieseler) epexegetis of the foregoing *ἡμῶν*. But apart from the fact that this *ἡμῶν* in the habitually used *Κύριος ἡμῶν* embraces *all* Christians, and consequently *αὐτῶν τε καὶ ἡμῶν* (*ἡμῶν* being referred to Paul and Sosthenes) would express something quite self-evident, and that, too, without any special significance of bearing,² the *position* of the words is decisive against this view, and in favour of attaching them to *παντὶ τόπῳ*, to which they necessarily belong as a more precise definition. Comp. Vulg. : “In omni loco *ipsorum et nostro*.” If, namely, *σὺν πᾶσι . . . ἡμῶν* must denote the Achaean Christians out of Corinth (see above), then *παντὶ τόπῳ* requires a limitation to the geographical district which is intended. Now, this limitation is not already *laid down* by *ἐν Κορίνθῳ* (Lücke, Wieseler), since it was precisely in the superscription that the need of *definiteness* in designating the readers was obvious, but it is expressly *given* by *αὐτῶν τε καὶ ἡμῶν*, in such a way, namely, that *αὐτῶν* refers to the *Corinthians*, who, however, are indicated not by *ἡμῶν*, but by *αὐτῶν*, because from the point where the widening of the address (*σὺν πᾶσι κ.τ.λ.*) comes in, the *Corinthians* appear as third parties. Accordingly the Epistle is addressed : *To the Corinthian Christians, and to all who, in every place that belongs to them (the Corinthians) and to us as well (Paul and Sosthenes), call upon the name of Christ*. Every place in the province, namely, where Christians lived or a church existed (as *e.g.* in Cenchreæ, Rom. xvi. 1), was a place which belonged to the *Corinthians*, a *τόπος αὐτῶν*, in so far as the church at Corinth was the mother-church of the Christian body in Achaia ; but each such place belonged also to *Paul* (and Sosthenes), in so far as he was the founder and apostolic head of Christianity in Corinth and all Achaia. It is quite in accordance with the ingenious subtlety of the apostle to give the designation of the provincials in such a form, as to make his own authority felt over against the prerogative of those living in the capital (*αὐτῶν*). As in

¹ [The New Testament knows nothing of two kinds of worship.—T. W. C.]

² It is supposed to convey a polemical reference to the party-divisions. See Wieseler, *l.c.* This can only be the case if

αὐτῶν applies to the *Corinthians*. But in fact, according to the view of Lücke and Wieseler (see below), it cannot do so, but must apply to the *other Achaeans*.

Rom. xvi. 13 αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐμοῦ delicately expresses the community of *love* (comp. also 1 Cor. xvi. 18 ; Philem. 11 ; Soph. *El.* 417 f. : πατὴρ τοῦ σοῦ τε καὶ ἐμοῦ), so here αὐτῶν τε καὶ ἡμῶν the community of *right*. The objection that the sense in which they belonged to the Corinthians was different from that in which they belonged to Paul and Sosthenes (de Wette), fails to appreciate the *point* of the words. The offence which Hofm. takes at the reading τε καὶ (as though it must be equivalent to εἴτε) arises from a misunderstanding ; it is the usual co-ordinating τε καὶ, which here has not even the *appearance* (Hartung, *Partik.* I. p. 100) of standing in place of εἴτε. Comp., on the contrary, Hartung, p. 101 ; Baeuml., *Partik.* p. 225. Observe, besides, that τε καὶ gives more rhetorical emphasis to the association of the two genitives than the simple καὶ ; see Dissen, *ad Dem. de cor.* p. 165. Rübiger, *krit. Unters.* p. 62 f., has assented to our view.¹ Comp. also Maier. Those who join σὺν πᾶσι κ.τ.λ. to κλητοῖς ἁγ. (see above) usually take αὐτῶν τε καὶ ἡμ. as an analysis of the idea παντί : in every place, *where they and where we* (Paul and Sosthenes) *are*, i.e. *elsewhere and here in Ephesus*. See Calovius, Rückert, de Wette, Osiander. But how meaningless this more precise explanation of παντί would be ! In fact, it would be absurd ; for, since the subject is *all* (πᾶσι κ.τ.λ.), in which the ἡμεῖς are thus already included, an analysis of it into αὐτοί (which the πάντες are surely already) and ἡμεῖς is utterly illogical. This applies also in opposition to Becker, by whom the τόπος ἡμῶν is held to be *Corinth*, and to refer to the *strangers* who come to Corinth. Others have, following Ambrosiaster, referred αὐτῶν to the *heathen lands*, and ἡμῶν to *Judaea* (Erasmus, Semler, Bolten ; similarly Schrader). Contrary to the text, as is also Wetstein's opinion : " P. suum locum vocat, ubi ipse per praedicationem evangelii ecclesiam fundaverat. Tacite se atque Sosthenem . . . opponit peregrino falso doctori, qui in locum non suum irrepserat." Others refer ἐν παντί . . . ἡμῶν to the different meeting-places of the parties (Vitranga, Mosheim, Eichhorn, Krause, Pott, Ewald), so that the τόπος ἡμῶν would be the house of Justus (Acts xviii. 7), or, generally, the place where the church had statedly assembled at first under Paul (Ewald) ; and the τόπ. αὐτῶν the meeting-house of the Petrine party, perhaps the Jewish synagogue (Pott), or, in general, the other places of assembly of the new sections (Ewald). But the presupposition that the church was broken up into parties locally separated from each other (see, on the contrary, xiv. 23, xi. 17 ff.) has not a single passage in the Epistle to justify it. Böttger, *l.c.* p. 25, holds, strangely, that αὐτῶν applies to the *Corinthian* Christians, and ἡμῶν to those of *Lower Achaia* (among whom Paul is supposed to have written ; see Introd. § 3) ; and Ziegler, that αὐτῶν applies to those in Corinth, ἡμῶν to those staying with Paul in Ephesus, Stephanas, Fortunatus, Achaicus (xvi. 17), and others. Hofmann propounds the peculiar view that καὶ ἡμῶν betokens that Paul was *at home*, and felt himself *to be so*, wherever Christ was invoked. As if the reader would have been capable of deducing any such ubiquity of spiritual domicile from the sim-

¹ Also Burger in his (popular) *Auslegung*, Erl. 1859, and Holtzmann, *Judenthum u. Christenth.* p. 749.

ple pronoun, and that, too, in the very address of the Epistle, without the slightest hint from the connection.

Ver. 3. See on Rom. i. 7.¹

Vv. 4-9. *Conciliatory preamble*, by no means without real praise (Hofmann), assuredly not ironical (Semler, comp. Mosheim), which would be unwise and wrong ; and not addressed merely to the party of Paul and that of Apollos (Flatt), which is at variance with ver. 2 ; but, as is alone in accordance with the character of Paul and with the words themselves, directed to the church as a whole under a persuasion of the truth of its contents,—bringing forward first of all with true affection what was laudable, so far as it existed, and lovingly leaving out of view for a time what was blameworthy, but withal soberly keeping within the bounds of truth and tracing all up to God.

Vv. 4, 5. *Μου*]² as in Rom. i. 8. — *πάντοτε*] *always*, to be measured not strictly by the literal import of the word, but by the fervour of his constant love. Comp. 1 Thess. i. 2 f. ; 2 Thess. i. 3. — *ἐπί*] *ground* of the thanks, Phil. i. 5 ; Polyb. xviii. 26. 4 ; Valck. *in loc.* The *grace of God*, which had been bestowed on them, is described more precisely in ver. 5 according to its effects. — *ἐν Χ. Ἰ.*] i.e. *in your fellowship with Christ*. By this is denoted the specifically *Christian* nature of the gift, in so far, namely, as it is not attained apart from Christ, but—otherwise it were a worldly gift—has *in Christ*, as the life-element of those who are its subjects, the distinctive sphere of its manifestation. Just in the same way ver. 5. — *ὅτι*] *that you, namely, etc.*, epexegetis of *ἐπὶ τῇ χάρι. κ.τ.λ.* — *ἐν παντί*] without limitation : *in all*, in every point ; comp. 2 Cor. ix. 11 ; 1 Tim. vi. 18 ; Eph. ii. 4 ; Jas. ii. 5. To this Paul forthwith, and again with *ἐν* (comp. 2 Cor. vi. 4), adds the more precise definition chosen in reference to the state of things at Corinth : *ἐν παντὶ λόγῳ κ. πάσῃ γνώσει* : *in all discourse and all knowledge*—that is to say, so that no kind of Christian aptitude of speech, or of Christian intelligence, is wanting among you, but both—the former outwardly communicative aptitude, in virtue of which a man *ἵσθαι δύναται* *ἑξαιρεῖν* (Clem. Cor. I. 48) ; and the latter, the inward endowment—are to be found with you richly in every form. This view, according to which *λόγος* is *sermo*, occurs in substance in the Greek commentators, in Calovius, Rückert, Neander, Hofmann, and many others, and is confirmed beyond a doubt by 2 Cor. viii. 7, xi. 6. As to the different *kinds* of Christian utterance, comp. 1 Cor. xii. 8. *Λόγος* is not therefore to be understood, with Billroth, de Wette, and Maier, of the *doctrine* preached to the Corinthians. Beza, Gro-

¹ See also the elaborate dissertation on the apost. benedictory greeting by Otto in the *Jahrb. für D. Theol.* 1867, p. 678 ff. The origin of that greeting, however, is hardly to be traced back, as the author holds, to the Aaronic blessing, Num. vi. 25 f. Otherwise it would always be *tripartite*, and, in particular, would not omit the characteristic *ἐλεος*. Now, the only Epistles in which it certainly occurs as *tripartite*, and with *ἐλεος*,

are the (post-Pauline) ones, 1 and 2 Tim. and 2 John 3 ; also Jude 2 (but with a peculiar variation). It was only at a later date that the Aaronic blessing passed over into Christian liturgic use *Constitt. ap.* ii. 57. 13) ; but a free reminiscence of that blessing may already be contained in the greetings of those late Epistles.

² [Westcott & Hort omit this word, but apparently without reason.—T. W. C.]

tius, and others take λόγος to be specially the *donum linguarum*, and γνώσις the *donum prophetiae*, which, however, is not conveyed either in the words themselves or in the connection, and is, moreover, at variance with the subordinate importance attached to the γλώσσαις λαλεῖν (chap. xiv.). Lastly, as to the running together of the two: ἐν πάσῃ γνώσει τοῦ λόγου (Schulz, Morus, Rosenmüller), the very repetition of the πάσῃ, and the difference in point of idea between the two words, should have dissuaded its supporters from such a view; for λόγ. and γνώσ. can as little be *synonyms* (Clericus, Pott) as רבך and נגד. Clement also, 1 Cor. 1, praises the former condition of the church with respect to τὴν τελείαν καὶ ἀσφαλῆ γνῶσιν.

Ver. 6. Καθὼς] *According as*, introduces the relation of that happy condition of things (ἐν παντὶ ἐπλουτίσθητε . . . γνώσει) to its cause. See on John xiii. 34, xvii. 2; 1 Cor. v. 7; Eph. i. 4; Phil. i. 7; Matt. vi. 12. — τὸ μαρτύριον τοῦ Χ.] characteristic designation of the *Gospel*, the publishers of which bear *witness of Christ*. Comp. 2 Tim. i. 8; Acts i. 8, iii. 15, *al.*; 2 Thess. i. 10; 1 Pet. v. i. Comp. μαρτ. τοῦ Θεοῦ, ii. 1. — ἐβεβαιώθη] is rendered by most: *is confirmed*,¹ *has been accredited* (Mark xvi. 20; Rom. xv. 8; Heb. ii. 3, *al.*); comp. also Rückert: “evinced as true by its effect on you;” and Ewald: “*guaranteed* among you by signs of the power of the Holy Spirit.” So, too, in substance, Hofmann. It is more in keeping, however, with the logical relation of καθὼς κ.τ.λ. to the foregoing, as well as with the βεβαιώσει of ver. 8 (comp. 2 Cor. i. 21; Col. ii. 7), to explain it of the *gospel becoming firmly established in their souls* (by steadfast faith), so that the opposite is expressed by the Johannine τὸν λόγον οὐκ ἔχετε μένοντα ἐν ὑμῖν (John v. 38). Comp. Billroth and de Wette. — ἐν ὑμῖν] *in animis vestris*.

Ver. 7. Result of τὸ μαρτ. τ. Χ. ἐβεβ. ἐν ὑμῖν, consequently parallel to ἐν παντὶ ἐπλουτ. ἐν αὐτοῖς. The negative expression μὴ ὑστερεῖσθαι ἐν is conceived quite after the analogy of the positive πλουτίζ. ἐν (see on ver. 5), so that ἐν denotes that *in which* one is behind (defectively constituted). Hence: *so that ye in no gift of grace are behind* (*i.e.* less rich than other churches.) Comp. Plat. *Pol.* vi. p. 484 D: μηδ' ἐν ἄλλῳ μηδενὶ μέρει ἀρετῆς ὑστηροῦντας. *Ecclus.* li. 24. The sense would be different, if the words were μηδενὸς χαρίσματος (*so that no gift of grace is lacking to you.*) See Rom. iii. 22; Luke xxii. 35; John ii. 3. Ruhnke. *ad Tim.* p. 51. Lobeck, *ad Phryn.* p. 237; *ad Soph. Aj.* 782. Χάρισμα is here to be taken (with Calvin and others, including Rosenmüller, Pott, de Wette, Maier) in the *wider* sense of the *spiritual blessings of Christianity generally*, in so far as believers are made partakers of them by the divine grace through the πνεῦμα ἅγιον (Rom. i. 11; 1 Cor. vii. 7); not, with most of the older expositors, as well as Billroth, Rückert, Olshausen, Hofmann, in the *narrower* sense of the extraordinary gifts (chap. xii. ff.). The proof of this is, first, that the immediately following ἀπεκδέχομ. κ.τ.λ. makes the μὴ ὑστερεῖσθαι ἐν μηδενὶ χαρίσματι appear as an *ethical* endowment; second, that the significant retrospective reference of the ἀνεγκλήτους in ver. 8 does not suit the χαρίσματα in the narrower sense,

¹ “Non de confirmatione *externa* verbi, quae fit per miracula, sed de confirmatione *interna* quae fit per testimonium Sp. St.,”

Calovius. Chrysostom understood it of *both*; Theodoret, Theophylact, and others, of the miracles only.

but does suit all the more strikingly the moral character of the Christian gifts of the Spirit in general. The form of expression in the singular here stands as little in the way of this view (in opposition to Hofmann) as at Rom. i. 11, and is, in fact, necessitated by the negative form of the discourse. Rückert, indeed, objects: "that Paul could not at all mean here those purely moral blessings, seeing that the Corinthians did not possess them." The apostle, however, is not speaking of every individual, but of the church taken as a whole (comp. already Chrysostom and Theophylact); and, moreover, expresses himself with much caution in a negative way, so that he only needs to answer for the presence of a *sufficienter praeditum esse* to stand comparison with other churches. — ἀπεκδεχομ. κ.τ.λ.] is a significant accompanying definition to what has gone before: *as persons, who* are not in any wise afraid of the revelation of Christ (1 Pet. i. 7; Col. iii. 3 f.) and wish it away, but *who are waiting* for it. This waiting and that afflux of grace stand in a mutual relation of action and reaction. Bengel says rightly: "*Character Christiani veri vel falsi, revelationem Christi vel expectare vel horrere.*" The fact that there were among the Corinthians deniers of the resurrection (and consequently of the Parousia in its full idea)—which, we may add, might naturally enough cause this hope to become all the more vividly prominent in the case of the rest—does not take away from the truth of the words, which hold good of the church *a potiori*. Just as little can they (contrary to the winning tone of the whole preamble) have it as their design to *terrify* with the thought of the day of judgment (Chrysostom), or to *censure* the doubters (Grotius, Rückert), or even to make *ironical* reference to the fancied perfection of the Corinthians (Mosheim). The participial clause, which needed neither ὥς nor the article, is not merely a *temporal* definition—consequently "*for the time*" of the waiting (Hofmann)—any more than at Tit. ii. 13; Rom. viii. 23; Jude 21. — ἀπεκδ.] denotes the *persevering* expectation. See on Rom. viii. 19; Fritzsche in *Fritzschor. Opusc.* p. 150 ff. The word does not indicate the element of *longing* (de Wette). See Rom. viii. 25; 1 Pet. iii. 20. For the subject-matter, comp. Phil. iii. 20; Tit. ii. 13; 2 Tim. iv. 8; Luke xii. 36.

Ver. 8. Ὁς] refers to Ἰησοῦ Χ., not, as Flatt, Pott, Billroth, Schrader, Olshausen, de Wette, Osiander, Ewald, Hofmann, with the majority of interpreters, assume, to the far-distant Θεός, ver. 4,—a view to which we are not compelled either by the Ἰησ. Χριστοῦ which follows (see below), or by ver. 9, seeing that the working of the exalted Christ is in fact subordinated to the will of God (iii. 23, xi. 3; Rom. viii. 34, *al.*). Comp. Winer, p. 149 [E. T. 196]. The apostle, however, is so full of Christ, as he addresses himself to his Epistle, that throughout the preamble he names Him in almost every verse, sometimes even twice. Comp. Rom. i. 1–7. — καί] *also*, denotes that which *corresponds* to the ἀπεκδέχεσθαι κ.τ.λ., What Christ will do. — βεβαιώσει] στηρίξει, Rom. xvi. 25; 1 Thess. iii. 13; 2 Cor. i. 21. The future stands here not *optatively* (Pott), but as expressive of a confident *hope* in the gracious working of Christ.¹ — ἕως τέλους] applies not to the end *of life*

¹ Chrysostom, Theodoret, Theophylact, and others, find in this expression an indi-

rect censure; as a hint that they were σαλευόμενοι and ἐγκλημασι νῦν ὑποκείμενοι. Δ

(Calovius, Flatt, and others), but, as the foregoing τ. ἀποκάλ. κ.τ.λ. and the following ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ κ.τ.λ. clearly show, to the end of the *pre-Messianic period* of the world's history (the αἰὼν οὗτος, see on Matt. xiii. 32), which is to be ushered in by the now nearly approaching (vii. 29, xv. 51) Parousia. Comp. x. 11 ; 2 Cor. i. 13. It is the συντέλεια τοῦ αἰῶνος, Matt. xiii. 39 f., xxiv. 3, xxviii. 20 ; comp. Heb. ix. 26. — ἀνεγκλήτους κ.τ.λ.] *result* of the strengthening : *so that ye shall be free from reproach in the day*, etc. Comp. 1 Thess. iii. 13. See respecting this proleptic usage generally, on Matt. xii. 13 ; Phil. iii. 21, and Jacob, *Quaest. epic.* ii. 4, p. 136 ff. Stallb. *ad Plat. Rep.* p. 560 D. — τοῦ Κυρίου κ.τ.λ.] The repetition of the noun instead of the mere pronoun is common in the classics also (Ellendt, *ad Arrian. Exp. Al.* i. 55 ; Kühner, *ad Xen. Mem.* i. 6. 1), and elsewhere in the N. T. (Winer, *l.c.* and p. 136 [E. T. 180]). Here (as at 2 Cor. i. 5 ; Eph. i. 13 ; Col. i. 13 f., *al.*) it has solemn emphasis. Comp. ver. 21. — It is to be noted, moreover, that the blamelessness in the day of Christ (comp. Rom. viii. 33) is conditioned (2 Tim. iv. 7) by perseverance in the faith (through which justification is appropriated) and consequently rests on the imputation of faith (Rom. iv. 4 f.) ; but is nevertheless, in virtue of the moral character and power of faith, as also in virtue of sanctification through the Spirit, of a thoroughly moral nature (Rom. vi. 1 ff., viii. 1 ff.), so that the ἀνέγκλητος at the Parousia appears not, indeed, as ἀναμάρτητος, but as καὶνὴ κτίσις ἐν Χριστῷ (2 Cor. v. 17), who, being divinely restored (Eph. ii. 10 ; Col. iii. 10) and progressively sanctified (1 Thess. v. 23), has worked out his own salvation (Phil. ii. 12) in the consecration of the moral power of the new spiritual life (Rom. viii. 2 f. ; Phil. i. 10 f., and now receives the βραβεῖον of his calling (Phil. iii. 14), the στέφανος of the δικαιοσύνη (2 Tim. iv. 8), in the δόξα of everlasting life.

Ver. 9. Ground of this confident hope. Comp. 1 Cor. x. 13 ; 1 Thess. v. 24 ; 2 Thess. iii. 3 ; Phil. i. 6 ; Rom. xi. 29. Were the βεβαίωσις on the part of Christ (ver. 8) not to take place, the divine call to the κοινωνία τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ would remain without effect, which would not be compatible with the *faithfulness* of God, from whom the call comes, and who, by His calling, gives pledge to us of eternal salvation (Rom. viii. 30).—Rückert finds in δι' οὗ, because God Himself is the caller, a veritable misuse of the preposition ; and others, as Beza and Rosenmüller, explain it without ceremony by ὑφ' οὗ, which D* F G in fact read. But Paul is thinking here in a *popular* way of the call as *mediated through God*. It is true, of course, that God is the *causa principalis*, but the mediating agency is also God's, ἐξ οὗ καὶ δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα (Rom. xi. 36) ; hence both modes of representation may occur, and διὰ may be used as well as ὑπό, wherever the context does not make it of importance to have a definite designation of the primary cause as such. Comp. Gal. i. 1 ; Plat. *Symp.* p. 186 E, *Pol.* ii. p. 379 E. Fritzsche, *ad Rom.* I. p. 15 ; Bernhardt, p. 235 f.—The κοινωνία τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ is *the fellowship with the Son of God* (genitive, as in 2 Cor. xi. 13 ; Phil. ii. 1 ; 2 Pet. i. 4), *i.e.* the participation in the filial relation of Christ, which, however,

view the more inappropriate, when we consider how natural and familiar to the apos-

tle was the thought expressed with respect to all his churches.

is not to be understood of the temporal relation of sonship, Gal. iii. 26 f. (*κοινωνίαν γὰρ υἱοῦ τῇ ν υἰοθεσίᾳ ἐκάλεσε*, Theodoret), nor of ethical fellowship (Grotius, Hofmann, and many others), but, in accordance with the idea of the *καλεῖν* which always refers to the Messianic kingdom, of *fellowship of the glory of the Son of God in the eternal Messianic life*,¹—a fellowship which will be the glorious *completion* of the state of *υἰοθεσία* (Gal. iv. 7). It is the *δόξα τῶν τέκνων τοῦ Θεοῦ* (Rom. viii. 21), when they shall be *συγκληρονόμοι τοῦ Χριστοῦ, σύμμορφοι* of His image, *συμβασιλεύοντες* and *συνδοξασθέντες*, Rom. viii. 17 ; comp. vv. 23, 29 ; 2 Thess. ii. 14 ; Col. iii. 4 ; Phil. iii. 20 f. ; 1 Cor. xv. 48 f. ; 2 Tim. ii. 12.

Ver. 10–iv. 21. *First section of the Epistle : respecting the parties, with a defence of the apostle's way of teaching.*

Vv. 10–16. *Exhortation to unity* (ver. 10), *statement of the character of their party-division* (vv. 11, 12), *and how wrong it was* (vv. 13–16).

Ver. 10. “*Exhortation*, however, lest ye miss this end of your calling, *exhortation* I give to you,” etc. — *ἀδελφοί*] winning and tender form of address, often introduced by Paul just at the point where he has a *serious* word to speak. Ver. 11, vii. 29, x. 1, xiv. 20, *al.* — *διὰ τοῦ ὀνόματος κ.τ.λ.*] *by means of the name*, etc., while I point you to the name of Christ, which, in truth, constitutes the *one* confession of all His disciples, and thereby set before you the motive to follow my exhortation. Comp. Rom. xii. 1, xv. 30 ; 2 Cor. x. 1 ; 2 Thess. iii. 12. Were the meaning *ex mandato Christi* (Heumann, Semler, Ernesti, and Rosenmüller), it would be expressed by *ἐν τῷ ὀνόμ.* (v. 4 ; 2 Thess. iii. 6, *al.*). — *ἵνα*] *design*, and in *this* form of conception, *contents* of the *παρακαλῶ*, as in xvi. 12, 15 ; 2 Cor. viii. 6, ix. 5 ; 2 Thess. ii. 17, and often in the Synoptic Gospels. — *τὸ αὐτὸ λέγητε*] *agreement of confessional utterance*, as opposed to the party-confessions of faith, at variance with each other, ver. 12. Luther renders it appropriately : “*einerlei Rede führet.*” The *consensus animorum* is only expressed in the *sequel* (*ἦτε δὲ κατηρτισμ. κ.τ.λ.*) ; in the first instance it is the outstanding *manifestation* of the evil that Paul has in view. This in opposition to Erasmus, Grotius, Estius, Wolf, and many others, including Heydenreich and Billroth, who explain the phrase of this inward agreement, which Paul would have known well how to express by *τὸ αὐτὸ φρονεῖν* (Rom. xv. 5 ; Phil. ii. 2 ; 2 Cor. xiii. 11), or in some similar *correct* way, and which, even in such passages as Thuc. v. 31. 5, Polyb. ii. 62, is not *expressed*, but *presupposed*. More expressive still is Polyb. v. 104. 1 : *λέγειν ἐν καὶ ταὐτό*, *to speak one and the same thing*. — *καὶ μὴ ἢ ἐν ὑμ. σχίσματα*] the same thought in *prohibitive* form (comp. Rom. xii. 14, *al.*), but designating the evil forbidden *more generally*, according to its *category*. — *ἦτε δὲ κ.τ.λ.*] *δέ*, *but rather*, *but on the contrary* (see Hartung, *Partikell.* I. p. 171 ; Klotz, *ad Devar.* p. 360 ; Baeuml. *Partik.* p. 95), introduces what ought to be the case instead of the forbidden *καὶ μὴ κ.τ.λ.* — *κατηρτισμένοι*] *fully adjusted, established in the right frame* (Vulg. *perfecti* ; Theophyl. *τέλειοι*). Comp. 2 Cor. xiii. 11 ; Gal. vi. 1 ; Heb. xiii. 11 ; 1 Pet. v. 10 ; Luke vi. 40. When there are divisions in a society, the

¹ Comp. Weiss, *biblische Theol.* p. 310.

κατάρτισις is wanting (2 Cor. xiii. 9 ; comp. καταρτισμός, Eph. iv. 12) ; hence Greek writers also use καταρτίζειν in speaking of the establishment of right relations by the removal of disunion (as here), sedition, or the like, Herod. v. 28. 106 ; Dion. Hal. *Antt.* iii. 10. Whether any *figurative* reference, however, of κατηρτ. to the original sense of σχίσματα, *fissurae*, be intended (to make whole and good again what was broken or rent, comp. Matt. iv. 21 ; Mark i. 19 ; Esdr. iv. 12, 13, 16 ; Herod. v. 106), as Bos, Elsner, Valckenaer, Pott, Heydenreich, and others think, and as Luther, Calvin ("apte cohaereatis"), and Beza, ("coagmentati") express by their renderings, may be doubted, because Paul does not more precisely and definitely indicate such a conception ; while, on the other hand, it was exceedingly common to use σχίσμα absolutely, and without special thought of its original material reference (Matt. ix. 16), to denote *dissidium* (John vii. 43, ix. 16, x. 19 ; 1 Cor. xi. 18, and even xii. 25). — ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ νοῖ κ.τ.λ.] the sphere, in which they were to be κατηρτ. Comp. Heb. xiii. 21. Νοῦς and γνώμη differ as *understanding* and *opinion*. Through the fact, namely, that Christians in Corinth *thought* differently (νοῦς) on important matters, and in consequence of this difference of thinking, formed in a partisan spirit different *opinions and judgments* (γνώμη), and fought for these against each other, the τὸ αὐτὸ λέγειν was wanting and σχίσματα prevailed. In opposition to this, the Corinthians were to agree together in Christian thinking¹ and judging ; the right state of things was to establish itself among them in ὁμονοεῖν and ὁμογνωμονεῖν (Thuc. ii. 97 ; Dem. 281. 21 ; Polyb. xxviii. 6. 2). In ἐριδες, ver. 11, we have the manifestation of the opposite of both of these, of Christian sameness of thought and opinion. That sameness, therefore, does not preclude the friendly discussion of points of difference in thought and judgment, with a view to mutual better understanding and the promotion of harmony, but it doubtless does preclude *party* differences and *hostility*. Ἀμφισβητοῦσι μὲν γὰρ καὶ δι' εὐνοίαν οἱ φίλοι τοῖς φίλοις, ἐρίζουσιν δὲ οἱ διαφοροῖ τε καὶ ἐχθροὶ ἀλλήλοις, Plat. *Prot.* p. 337 B. Many other interpreters take γνώμη as referring to the *practical* disposition (to love) ; whereas νοῦς denotes the *theoretical* understanding. See Chrysostom, Theodoret, and Theophylact, who says : ὅταν γὰρ τὴν αὐτὴν πίστιν ἔχωμεν, μὴ συναπτώμεθα δὲ κατὰ τὴν ἀγάπην, τὰ μὲν αὐτὰ νοοῦμεν, διῃστάμεθα δὲ κατὰ τὴν γνῶμην. But this separation between theory and practice is quite arbitrary ; and γνώμη never means in the N. T. "disposition," but always (even in Rev. xvii. 13, 17) *sententia*, *judicium*. Comp. the classical τῆς αὐτῆς γνώμης εἶναι, to have one and the same view, Thuc. i. 113, iii. 70. Eur. *Hec.* 127 : ἐκ μιᾶς γνώμης, Dem. 147. 1 : διὰ μιᾶς γνώμης γίνεσθαι, Isocr. *Paneg.* 38 : τὴν αὐτὴν ἔχειν γνῶμην, Plat. *Alc.* 2, p. 139 A. The converse : ἐγένοντο δίχα αἱ γνῶμαι, Herod. vi. 109.

Ver. 11. Motive for the foregoing exhortation. — ὑπὸ τῶν Χλόης] comp. Rom. xvi. 10 ; Winer, p. 179 [E. T. 238]. *What* persons belonging to Chloe are meant, was as well known to the readers as it is unknown to us. Grotius and Valckenaer understood "*mortuae Chloes liberos* ;" others gen-

¹ The sense of "*disposition*" is wrongly attributed to νοῦς (Rückert, Neander,

Maier). This is not the case even in Rom. i. 28, xii. 2 ; Eph. iv. 17 ; see *in loc.*

erally, “*those of her household* ;” others, again, “*slaves*,” as undoubtedly such genitives are sometimes to be explained by δοῦλος (Schaef. *ad Bos. Ell.* p. 117 f.) ; comp. Plat. *Phaed.* p. 60 A. *Chloe* herself is *commonly* held to be a *Corinthian* Christian, members of whose household had come to Ephesus. It seems, however, more in accordance with apostolic discretion to suppose (with Michaelis) that she was an *Ephesian* well known to the Corinthians, members of whose household had been in Corinth and returned thence.—The *name* (familiar as a surname of *Demeter*) occurs also elsewhere ; Hor. *Od.* i. 23, iii. 9. 6 ; Long. *Past.* 7. We may add that Bengel remarks well on ἐδηλώθη (comp. Col. i. 8) : “*exemplum delationis bonae nec sine causâ celandae.*” It was in fact the fulfilment of a *duty of love*.

Ver. 12. *Now what I mean* (by this ἐριδες ἐν ὑμῖν εἰσι) *is this* (which follows), *that*, etc. Regarding the explicative λέγω, common also in Greek writers, comp. Gal. iii. 17 ; Rom. xv. 8. Calvin and Beza understand it, making τοῦτο retrospective : *I say this, because*, etc. But, not to speak of the less suitable meaning thus attained, τοῦτο in all parallel passages points invariably *forward* (Gal. iii. 17 ; Eph. iv. 17 ; 1 Cor. vii. 29, xv. 50), except when, as in vii. 35, Col. ii. 4, a *clause expressive of design* follows. — ἐκαστος] *Each* of you speaks in one of the forms following. Comp. xiv. 26. Chrysostom says aptly : οὐ γὰρ μέρος, ἀλλὰ τὸ πᾶν ἐπενέμετο τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἡ φθορά. — *Nothing* is to be supplied with the genitive Παύλου κ.τ.λ., for εἶναί τινος means *to belong to any one, addictum esse*. See Seidl. *ad Eur. El.* 1098 ; Ast, *Lex. Plat.* I. p. 621 ; Winer, p. 184 [E. T. 243 f.]. — Κηφᾶ] The *Jewish* name (כִּיפָא) is so usual with Paul (iii. 22, ix. 5, xv. 5, and see the critical remarks on Gal. i. 18) that it is only in Gal. ii. 7, 8 that we find Πέτρος employed by him ; hence the less may we regard Κηφᾶ here as taken directly from the lips of the Jewish Petrine party (Estius).—The *order* of the four names is *historical*, following that in which the parties successively arose.—For a connected review of them and the relative literature, see *Introduct.* § 1. The following remarks may be added from the exegetical standpoint : (1) The Χριστοῦ and ver. 14 ff. invalidate at once the theory held by the Fathers (Chrysostom, Theodoret, Oecumenius, Theophylact, and others, see Rübiger, *krit. Unters.* p. 9) and many of the older commentators, including Michaelis, and based principally on iv. 6, that the three first names were fictitious merely, and used in order to avoid bringing forward by name the real heads of the parties. (2) There can be no reduction of the number of the parties below *four*, although many attempts have been made to bring together not only the partisans of Paul and of Apollos (as having but a formal difference), but also the Petrine and the Christine parties (J. E. Chr. Schmidt, *Bibl. f. Krit. u. Exeg.* I. p. 91 ; Baur in the *Tüb. Zeitschr.* 1831, 4, p. 61 ff., and in his *Paulus*, I. p. 291 ff., ed. 2 ; also Billroth, Lechler, and others) ; or else—which, however, is merely a drawing of them together in form—to reduce the four to two main parties, the apostolic and the Christine (Neander, Jaeger, and Schenkel) ; or, lastly, by exegetical expedients (Rübiger), either to get rid of the Christ-party *altogether* (see below), or at least to take them out of the list of *parties* by assuming that they were approved of by the apostle (Schott, with older interpreters). Paul, in fact,

sets forth quite uniformly *four* definite diversities of confession standing in contrast, and then shows in ver. 13 how sad and how preposterous this state of division was.—In the face of this manifest mode of reckoning and disposing of the parties by the apostle himself in this passage, several theories, respecting more particularly (3) *the Christ-party*, must be dismissed as untenable. Among these is (a) the view repeatedly brought forward from the days of Chrysostom :¹ “Mentionem eorum propterea fecit una cum illis, quod, cujusnam generis essent dissidia inter Cor. excitata, *perspicue explicare* non poterat, nisi ita, ut diceret, alios hunc, alios illum praeferre doctorem, aliis (recte quidem, 1 Cor. iii. 23) se Christi sectatores simpliciter appellatibus” (Schott, *Isag.* 233). With respect to this, it is to be observed that iii. 23 implies *not* the justification of those λέγοντες ἐγὼ δὲ Χριστοῦ, but the truth of the *idea*,² from the abuse of which that fourth party arose which in the passage before us appears under a precisely similar condemnation to that of the other three. (b) The theory invented by Baur³ in behalf of the antagonism between Paulinism and Petrinism (comp. also Lechler, p. 386) : that the same party called themselves both τοὺς Κηφᾶ, because Peter had the primacy among the apostles of the Jews, and also τοὺς Χριστοῦ, because they held direct connection with Christ to be the main mark of true apostleship, and therefore counted Paul far behind the other apostles ;⁴ that the Christ-party, in fact, were the most thoroughgoing disciples of Peter (comp. Billroth and Credner, *Einl.* sec. 132 ; also Reuss, and especially Holsten, *z. Ev. d. Paul. u. Petr.* p. 25 f.). (c) The opinion of Becker, that the Christine party were Jewish-Christians, who had attached themselves to the followers of Peter that had come from a distance to Corinth, but, as having been converted by Paul and Apollos, had called themselves not after Peter, but after Christ. (d) Rübiger's view, according to which the Christ-party is purely a creation of the exegetes, ἐγὼ δὲ Χριστοῦ being *the utterance common to the three parties* ; so that all, indeed, professed allegiance

¹ He, however, holds that Paul added “ἐγὼ δὲ Χριστοῦ” καὶ οἰκοθεν (*i.e.* ἀφ’ ἑαυτοῦ, as Theophylact has it), βουλόμενον βαρύτερον τὸ ἐγκλημα ποιῆσαι καὶ δεῖξαι οὕτω καὶ τὸν Χριστὸν εἰς μέρος δοθέντα ἔν, εἰ καὶ μὴ οὕτως ἐποίουν τοῦτο ἐκεῖνοι. Comp. also Theodoret, who lays stress on the special wisdom of this procedure.

² The rightness of the confession : ἐγὼ δὲ Χριστοῦ, *considered in and by itself*, explains also why Clement, 1 Cor. 47, mentions only the other three parties and not the Christ-party as well. He is speaking against the attachment to *human* party-leaders. He *might* indeed, in some way suitable to the connection of his exhortation, have brought in the Christine party (which he doubtless would have done, if they had been as bad as they have been made out to be of late), but there was no *necessity* for his doing so. Hence it is unwarrantable to infer (with Rübiger) the *non-existence* of a special Chris-

tine party from its *non-mention*. Origen also does *not* quote the ἐγὼ δὲ Χριστοῦ with the rest of the passage in one instance, although he *does* in another.

³ See Beyschlag, p. 225 ff.—Hilgenfeld (see his *Zeitschr.* 1865, p. 241) calls Baur's dissertation of 1831, “the ancestral stronghold of our whole criticism.” If so, it is a *ruin*, like so many other ancestral strongholds. It could not so much as stand firm against the simple words ἐγὼ δὲ Χριστοῦ, into which Baur put a meaning as if Paul had written : ἐγὼ δὲ τῶν ἀποστόλων Χριστοῦ. The confession ἐγὼ δὲ Χριστοῦ necessarily transcends *all* apostolic authority, and excludes it.

⁴ Comp. Hilgenfeld, who holds that they were immediate disciples of Christ, who sought to establish the exclusive authority of the original apostles, denying to Paul the Χριστοῦ εἶναι. See also Hilgenfeld in his *Zeitschr.* 1864, p. 165 f.

to Christ, but the strife between them consisted in this, "that they made participation in Christ dependent on different teachers, each holding that they, inasmuch as they belonged to a particular teacher, had the real and true Christ,—a better Christ than the others." This explanation, if we judge in accordance with the preceding elements in ver. 12, is an exegetical impossibility. It has been already well said by Calovius : " Et illi, qui a Christo Christianos se dicebant, *quatenus ab aliis sese per schisma separabant, illo nomine sibi solum appropriato, schismatis rei erant.*" Since they are ranked, just as the others, under the category of the *σχίσματα* and *ἐριδες* (vv. 10, 11), and their fault is set before them as before the others, ver. 13, by *μεμέρ. ὁ Χριστός*, we cannot even characterize them, with Eichhorn, as *neutrals*.—To name Christ as their Head was so extremely natural for a party who, as contrasted with the others, wished to keep themselves free from all authority of human teachers (see Introd. § 1 ; also Rückert, Bleek, *Einkl.*, Hofm. 16 f.), that there is no need whatever for any attempt at a different explanation ; such as Eichhorn's imagination, that they rested upon the sayings of Jesus in the *Protevangelium* ; or the view of Grotius, Witsius, Wetstein, and Ziegler, that they had heard Christ themselves,¹ or at least their founder had (if the former, how disproportionately small must their number needs have been ! and if the latter, they would surely have named themselves after their founder, since Peter, too, was a personal disciple of Christ). Equally undeserving of acceptance is Storr's view (*Opusc.* II. p. 252 ff.), adopted by Rosenmüller, Krause, Hug, Heydenreich, and Flatt (comp. also Bertholdt, *Einkl.* VI. p. 3319), that they had called themselves *τοῦ Χριστοῦ*, as *followers of James the brother of Christ*. This is an empty conjecture, not to be supported by ix. 5, xv. 9 ; and it has, besides, especially this against it, that the followers of the venerated James would have had no ground, as distinguished from the other parties, for not calling themselves *οἱ τοῦ Ἰακώβου* or *οἱ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ τοῦ Κυρίου*, and that James also would have been mentioned with the rest in iii. 22, as well as in Clem. 1 *Cor.* 47, if the Christ-party had not referred themselves directly to Christ.—This claim, moreover, of a direct relation to Christ as regards His exclusive authority, found its sufficient ground and justification in the general *acquaintance* with the doctrine and work of Christ, which was owing to the living presence of the gospel tidings in the churches. There is no evidence in the Epistles themselves of any other and *peculiar* connection with the Lord being laid claim to by the Christ-party. This holds especially of *Schenkel's* view, that the Christ-party, consisting of Jewish-Christians from Asia Minor with theosophic training, had asserted a supernatural connection with Christ through *visions and revelations*, their spiritual condition consequently having its analogues at a later date in Cerinthus, Marcion, the Montanists, and the like ; and that this party had its continuation in those who opposed the presbyters in Clem-

¹ This view is taken up again by Thiersch, *d. Kirche im apost. Zeitalter*, p. 143 ff. He regards the Christ-party as *personal disciples of Christ*, who had come to Corinth from Jerusalem and probably also from Rome,

with Pharisaic views, proud of their Hebrew descent and of their having known Christ in the flesh, disputing the apostleship of Paul, etc.

ent's Epistle. Schenkel's theory (defended also by Grimm in the *Lit. Bl. zur allg. Kirchenzeit.* 1851, No. 82) bases itself especially on the passages ix. 1 ; 2 Cor. x. 7, xii. 1. To explain these, however, there is no need to suppose any allusion to *theosophic* opponents, or any reference to the Christ-party at all, since Paul—more especially if they had been a party standing in such (fanatical) antagonism *in point of principle* to himself—would have combated them directly and in detail, and that in the section of the Epistle which deals expressly with the party-divisions (down to iv. 21).¹ And to connect them with the opponents of the presbyters in Clement is all the more arbitrary, because that writer, while finding a parallel to the factions which he blames in the parties of Paul, Apollos, and Peter, makes no reference whatsoever to the Christ-party,—a silence which is eloquent enough to make us hesitate in ascribing to them any such extreme and dangerous character as some have lately imputed to them, and to incline us rather to the view of their fundamental principle being one in itself sound, but perverted in its application by party-spirit. In addition to de Wette, Lutterbeck, and Maier, Goldhorn and Dähne agree in substance with Schenkel, seeking amidst differences in detail to prove the existence of Jewish-Alexandrian philosophy in the Christ-party ; just as Kniewel (comp. Grimm) regards them as forerunners of the Gnostics. According to Ewald, they are the adherents of some unknown teacher of *Essene* views, who, “founding, doubtless, on some special evangelic writing, and in accordance therewith exalting the example of Christ personally above all else, disapproved of marriage ;” they were, *in truth, the first Christian monks and Jesuits.*² But it is very doubtful whether the rejection of marriage in chap. vii. should be traced precisely to the *Christ-party* ; and, apart from this, there is not in the Epistles to the Corinthians a single vestige of the phenomena of *Essene* Christianity, or in particular of *Essene* asceticism, as at Rome and Colossae ; while, on the other hand, the rejection of marriage does not appear among the Romans and Colossians who held *Essene* views. Comp. on vii. 1.—Lastly, after this examination of the different views entertained regarding the Christ-party, the question *whether they were Jewish* (as commonly held) *or Gentile Christians* answers itself to this effect, that *they were composed of both elements*, as also were the adherents of Paul and of Apollos. For we have not the slightest ground for assuming that, when the division in the church arose upon matters turning on the respect due to individual men, it was either Jewish Christians *alone*, or Gentile Christians *alone*, who gave themselves to the idea of renouncing the acknowledgment of any human teacher, and seeking instead to be τοῦ Χριστοῦ. This holds good in particular against

¹ The force of this argument is doubtless evaded by the assumption, that the leaders of the party had probably not developed their hurtful influence until after the arrival in Corinth of our first Epistle. But this is simply an unwarranted evasion.

² According to Ewald's *Gesch. d. apost. Zeit.* p. 506 f., ed. 3, they readily allowed themselves to be carried away by the zeal

for the law of their Pharisaic brethren, and became a support for their position. Those of the Christ-party with Pharisaic tendencies were joined, too, by some who boasted that they had once known Christ Himself familiarly, nay, that they had seen Him when risen from the dead, so that they laid claim to apostolic estimation.

Neander, who makes the Christ-party to be Gentile Christians, of a certain philosophic culture and of rationalistic tendency, to whom Christ appeared as a second, perhaps greater, Socrates, but who could not bring themselves to accept the doctrine of Christ in the form given to it by the apostles, and sought rather by philosophic criticism, which they exercised also on the doctrine of the resurrection (chap. xv.), to separate, possibly with the help of a collection of the sayings of the Lord, the pure teaching of Christ from the mass of received material. In how totally different a way must Paul have come forward against any such syncretistic rationalism ! See, besides, in reply to this, Beyschlag, p. 220 ff. Altogether, there were but few men of philosophic training who had come over to Christianity at Corinth (ver. 26) ; and those who had at least a philosophic tendency found the food for which they sought with Apollos. And it is a groundless assumption to maintain that what Paul says against worldly wisdom (chap. i. 2) is spoken with a polemic reference to the Christ-party (this in opposition to Schenkel, Jaeger, Goldhorn, Dähne, Kniewel, and others) ; see, on the contrary, chap. iii. and iv. 6. In like manner, too, it is arbitrary, and in any case unsafe to proceed, from the point at which Paul passes from discussing the state of division in the church to speak of other existing evils (from chap. v. onwards), to apportion the latter among the several parties, and by this method, as well as by means of expressions and details from the second Epistle, to depict the character more especially of the Christ-party, whom Jaeger¹ makes in this manner to appear in the most damaging light, while Osiander² treats them prejudicially in another way, finding in them the originators of sectarian Ebionitism. Beyschlag, too, in his investigation, proceeds by the same uncertain path, putting together the characteristics of the Christ-party especially from the second Epistle. According to him they were Judaists, although free from Judaistic errors in doctrine, who depreciated the apostle Paul, but prided themselves on their Hebrew origin, their labours and sufferings for Christ, their more precise historical acquaintance with and information regarding Christ, whom they had known personally, as also on their visions and revelations of Him. In connection with this view, Beyschlag is forced to assume that it was only in the interval between the first and second Epistle that the Christ-party had developed such keen and personal antagonism to the apostle,—an assumption made also by Hilgenfeld. If, notwithstanding this development of hostility, they are to be taken as Judaists *free from Judaistic anti-Pauline doctrine*, we stand confronted by a complete anomaly in the history of the antagonism between the Judaistic and the Pauline currents in the apostolic church, so far as that is known to us from other quarters. And it seems the less possible to ex-

¹ He depicts them as wealthy Jewish Christians, familiar with Greek science, who professed attachment to the spirit of Christianity alone, but concealed under this mask lawlessness and immorality, and were deniers of the resurrection.

² Originating, according to him, from the Petrine party, they had, while holding fast

to the idea of Christ being the Supreme teacher, fallen into a one-sided way of considering only His appearance as a man on earth, and more especially His teaching, and of allowing the theocratic aspect of the Lord's life and work to pass more out of sight.

plain this anomaly by the supposition of a cunning reticence on the part of the persons in question, the more we see how bitter and passionate their opposition to Paul must have been, and the more we find it difficult—considering their cunning—to perceive why they should not have contented themselves with making common cause with the *Petrine* party, instead of forming a distinct faction of their own. (A)

Ver. 13. Μεμέρισται ὁ Χριστός] affirmative (with Lachmann and Kniewel ; so *τινές* as early as Theodoret), not interrogatory (as commonly taken), setting forth *the tragical result of the aforesaid state of party-division*, ver. 12, and that with arresting emphasis from the absence of any connective particle : *Christ is divided ! i.e.* in place of being whole and undivided, the One common Christ of all, He is *broken up into different party-Christ*s ! Such, that is to say, is the actual appearance of things when, of several parties mutually exclusive of one another, each seems to have its own separate Christ.¹ The reproach here conveyed suits the Christ-party also (against Rübiger), just as forming a *party*, but not them *alone* (Hofmann). The *interrogatory* rendering, common since Chrysostom : *Is Christ divided ?* taken as a question of surprise, has nothing against it linguistically (see esp. Valckenaer, II. p. 71 f.), but it is liable to the objection that it is only with the following *μή* that the text gives us to recognize the beginning of the interrogative address.² Had Paul intended *μεμέρ. ὁ Χ.* as a question, it would have been most natural for him in the flow of his discourse to carry on the same form of interrogation, and say : ἡ Παῦλος ἐστ. ὑπ. ὑμ. The text, I may add, gives no warrant for interpreting Χριστός of the *corpus Chr. mysticum*, i.e. *the church* (Estius, Olshausen, and others ; *τινές* in Theodoret), or even of the *doctrina Chr.*, which is not *varia et multiplex* (Grotius, Mosheim, Semler, Morus, Rosenmüller). — *μή Παῦλος κ.τ.λ.*] *Paul surely was not*, etc. From this point on to ver. 16 the *incongruous nature of the first party-confession of faith* is specially exposed. Bengel aptly remarks : “Crux et baptismus nos Christo asserit ; relata : redimere, se addicere.” The two questions correspond to the mutual connection between *believing* and *being baptized*. — ὑπέρ] *on behalf of*, in the sense of atonement.³ Comp. on Gal. i. 4 ; Eph. v. 2. — εἰς τὸ ὄνομα] *in reference to the name*, as the name of him who is to be henceforth the object of the faith and confession of the individual baptized. Comp. on Matt. xxviii. 19 and Rom. vi. 3.—There was no need of a single word more regarding the *first* of these two questions ; the

¹ The conception is not that Christ is *broken up into parts or fragments*, so that the one party should possess *this*, the other *that*, part (see Baur, de Wette, Rückert, Calvin, etc., with Chrysostom and Theophylact) ; for each party gave itself out as the possessor of the whole Christ, not simply of a part, He standing to it in the relation of its Lord and Head. To this conception corresponds, too, the ἐγὼ δὲ Χριστοῦ, instead of which it would not have been necessary that it should run, ἐμοῦ ὁ Χριστός, as Hofmann objects.

² [But compare the usage in 2 Cor. iii. 1, where the particle is given only in the second question.—T. W. C.]

³ Lachm. reads περὶ ὑμῶν, instead of ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν, following only B D* ; too weakly attested, and deserving of rejection also on this ground, that Paul always uses ὑπὲρ (even in 1 Thess. v. 10) where the death of Christ is placed in relation to *persons, for whom* He died. Comp. on xv. 3, which is the only certain passage in Paul's writings where ὑπὲρ occurs with an abstract term. See also Wieseler on Gal. i. 4.

answer to it was so self-evident. But as to the *second*, the apostle has some remarks to make, vv. 14-16.

Vv. 14, 15. God be thanked, that I baptized only a very few among you ! Accordingly no room has been left for the reproach being brought against me, as it might otherwise have been, that I had baptized into *my own* name ! “Providentia divina regnat saepe in rebus, quarum ratio postea cognoscitur” (Bengel). Rückert finds fault with the *weakness* of this proof, since it was surely the same thing whether Paul had baptized personally or through his assistants. But unjustly. For, since Paul was not generally in the habit of baptizing in person, had he himself baptized many in Corinth, this might undoubtedly have been made use of afterwards by perverse minds for the possible slander that there was a specialty in the case, that he had baptized with his own hand in Corinth, because he did it into *his own* name,—a purpose for which, of course, he could not have employed others. Hofmann suggests wrongly : they might have interpreted it, as though he had wished to place the persons concerned “*in a peculiar relation*” to himself. This imported indefiniteness is against the definite sense of the words. Just as he had said before, that it was not *he* who had been crucified for them in place of *Christ*, so he says further, that they had not been baptized into *his* name instead of the name of *Christ*. But the two points just show how wholly *absurd* the confession ἐγὼ μὲν εἰμι Παύλου is, because it would have such absurd *premisses*. — Κρίσπον] See Acts xviii. 8. — Γάϊον] See on Rom. xvi. 23. — ἵνα μή] is never elsewhere, and is not here, to be taken as : *so that not*, but it denotes the *design*, arranged in the divine providential leading, of the οὐδένα ὑμ. ἐβάπτισα (comp. ver. 17 ; 2 Cor. i. 9, *al.*).

Ver. 16. Another Corinthian family baptized by him occurs to his mind. He adds it conscientiously, and then cuts off any possibility of his being reproached with untruthful omission by λοιπὸν οὐκ οἶδα κ.τ.λ. Regarding Stephanas, we know nothing save from xvi. 15, 17. — Λοιπὸν is the simple *ceterum*, *otherwise*, *besides that*. Comp. 2 Cor. xiii. 11 ; 1 Thess. iv. 1 ; frequent in Greek writers also after Polybius.

Vv. 17-31. *Paul justifies the simplicity of his way of teaching by the contents of the gospel.* This, like all that follows on to iv. 21, is directed primarily against the pride of wisdom displayed by the party which certainly threatened most danger in the circumstances of the Corinthian church,—the party, namely, of *Apollos* (not that of *Christ*) ; see iii. 4, iv. 6. As to the Petrine and the Christine-party, there is no special entering into details ; it is only in passing that the judgment is extended so as to include them also (see iii. 22).

Ver. 17. Rapid and skilful *transition* (comp. Rom. i. 16) to *this* (οὐ γὰρ . . . εὐαγγ.),¹ and *theme of the section* (οὐκ ἐν σοφίᾳ . . . Χριστοῦ). — οὐ γὰρ κ.τ.λ.]

¹ Suggested naturally by what had been said in vv. 14, 16, and without any ironical side-glance at those who had prided themselves on their *baptizers* (Calovius) ; in particular, not levelled at boastings on this ground on the part of Jewish-Christians

who had been baptized by Peter (Hofmann) ; nor yet against *teachers* “qui praetextu ceremoniae gloriolam venantur” (Calvin and Oslander). Such polemical references are dragged in without warrant in the text.

In the assured consciousness that the design of his apostolic mission was *teaching*, Paul recognized that *baptizing*, as an external office and one that required no special gift, should as a rule be left to others, the apostolic *ὑπερῆται* (Acts xiii. 5), in order to avoid, for his own part, being drawn away from following out that higher aim, which was his specific calling. A very needful and salutary division of duties, considering the multitude of those converted by him ! Peter, too, acted in the same way (Acts x. 48), and perhaps all the apostles. Nor was this contrary to Christ's command in Matt. xxviii. 19, seeing that, according to it also (comp. Luke xxiv. 47 ; Mark xvi. 15), teaching was the main business of the apostolic office, while the baptismal command was equally fulfilled by baptism performed by means of others authorized by the apostles.¹—*οὐ . . . ἀλλ'* is not here, any more than elsewhere, to be taken as equivalent to *non tam . . . quam* (Beza, Piscator, Grotius, Estius, Storr, Rosenmüller, Flatt, Pott, and others ; comp. also Fritzsche, *ad Marc.* p. 785), but *absolutely* (see Winer, p. 461 ff. [E. T. 621 ff.] ; Klotz, *ad Devar.* p. 9 f.) ; and the absoluteness of the negation is not at all to be set down to the account of the strong rhetorical colouring (Rückert, comp. Buttmann, *neut. Gr.* p. 306 [E. T. 356]). *To baptize* was really *not the purpose* for which Christ sent Paul, but *to preach* (Acts ix. 15, 20, xxii. 15, xxvi. 16–18) ; in saying which it is not implied that he was not authorized to administer baptism (*εἰς μὲν γὰρ τὸ μεῖζον ἀπεσταλὴν, ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ καὶ τὸ ἐλαττον ἐνεργεῖν οὐκ ἐκωλύθη*, Theophylact), but sent *in order to baptize* he was not. Comp. Chrysostom, Theodoret, and Theophylact.—*οὐκ ἐν σοφίᾳ λόγον* does not belong to *ἀπέστ.* (Storr, Flatt), which would be an involved construction, but links itself closely to *εὐαγγελίζεσθαι*, as telling in what element that does not take place. The negation is *objective*, attaching to the object (Kühner, II. § 714. 1 ; Baeumlein, *Partik.* p. 257 ff.), negating actually the *ἐν σοφίᾳ* : hence not *μή*. That *σοφία λόγον* is not the same as *λόγος σόφος*, λ. *σεσοφισμένος* (Erasmus, Grotius, and many others, including Flatt and Pott), but emphasizes *σοφία* as the main conception, may be seen in Winer, p. 221 f. [E. T. 296 f.] : *to preach without wisdom of speech*, without the discourse having a philosophic character,—as desired by the Hellenic taste. We are not to apply this, however, to the philosophic *contents* of the teaching (Storr, Rosenmüller, Flatt, and others), but to the *form*, which consists in the clothing of the doctrine in philosophic garb, in speculative skill, argumentative reasoning, illustration, elaboration of the matter, and the like, together with the effect which this, from the nature of the case, may have upon the doctrine itself. For it followed as a matter of course from Paul's being sent *by Christ*, that he was not to preach a *doctrine* of this world's wisdom (as did Plato, Aristotle, the Sophists, etc.) ; what he had to do was to deliver the substance of the *εὐαγγελίζεσθαι*—which

¹ According to Ritschl, *altkath. Kirche*, p. 369, baptism was performed on the others by those three, who themselves had been first baptized by Paul, and who had become overseers. Against this view it may be at once urged, that if he had regarded

the baptism of those three in *that* light, Stephanas would not have occurred to him only by way of *afterthought*. Besides, there must have been baptized converts there before a presbytery could be erected. Comp. Acts xiv. 23.

is in truth *given* for all cases alike—without casting it in any philosophic mould; his *speech* was not to be ἐν σοφίᾳ, lest its *substance* should lose its essential character. This *substance* was the crucified Christ, about whom he had to preach, not in the style and mode of presentation used by the wisdom of this world,—not in such a way that his preaching would have been the setting forth of a Christian philosophy of religion. Even the *dialectic* element in Paul's discourses widely differs from anything of this sort. — ἵνα μὴ κενωθῇ κ.τ.λ.] aim of the εὐαγγ. οὐκ ἐν σοφ. λ.: *in order that the cross of Christ might not be emptied* (comp. Rom. iv. 14) *of its essence divinely effectual for salvation* (Rom. i. 16). *The cross of Christ*—that Christ was crucified (and thereby won salvation for us),—this fact alone was the pure main *substance* (“nucleus et medulla,” Calovius) of the apostolic preaching, and as such has the essential quality of proving itself in all believers the saving power of God, and of thereby, in the way of inward living experience, bringing to nought all human wisdom (vv. 18, 19 ff.). Now, had the cross of Christ been preached ἐν σοφίᾳ λόγον, it would have been emptied of its divine and essential power to bless, since it would then have made common cause with man's wisdom, and therefore, instead of overthrowing the latter, would have exalted it and made it come, totally alien in nature as it was, in place of itself. Bengel says well: “Sermo autem crucis *nil heterogeneum admittit.*” — With marked emphasis, ὁ σταυρὸς τοῦ Χριστοῦ is put *last*.

Ver. 18. Establishment of the foregoing ἵνα μὴ . . . Χριστοῦ. Were, namely, the doctrine of the cross, although folly to the unbelieving, not a power of God to believers, it would be impossible to speak of a ἵνα μὴ κενωθῇ of its substance, the cross of Christ, as the aim of the εὐαγγ. οὐκ ἐν σ. λ. — The ἐστὶ with the dative expresses the *actual* relation in which the λόγος stands to both; it is for them *in fact* (not, as might be thought, simply in their *judgment*) the one and the other. — τοῖς ἀπολλυμ.] to those *who are subject to* (eternal) ἀπώλεια. Comp. 2 Cor. ii. 15, iv. 3; 2 Thess. ii. 10. The *present* participle¹ betokens either the *certainty* of the future destruction (Bernhardy, p. 371), or it brings the being lost before us as a development which is already taking place in them; just as τοῖς σωζομ., *those who are saved unto Messianic bliss.* (B) From xv. 2, Rom. v. 9, 10, viii. 24, *al.*, also Eph. ii. 5–8, the former mode of conceiving it seems to be the correct one; comp. ii. 6. Paul designates in this way the believers and unbelievers, ἀπὸ τοῦ τέλους τὰς προσηγορίας τιθεῖς, Theodoret. He has certainly (Rückert) conceived of both classes as *predestinated* (ver. 24; Rom. viii. 29, ix. 11, 19, 22 f.; Eph. i. 4 f.; 2 Thess. ii. 13, *al.*); but this point remains here out of view. — μωρία] This doctrine is to them (to their conscious experience) *an absurdity* (μωρία τε καὶ ἀλογία, Plat. *Epin.* p. 983 E; Dem. 397, pen.). Why? see ver. 22. Comp. 2 Cor. iv. 3. Billroth's answer is un-Pauline. — ἡμῖν] is not put last out of modesty (Billroth), but because the emphasis of the contrast lies on the idea of τοῖς σωζομ. Comp. Eur. *Phoeniss.* 1738. Pors.: ἐλαύνειν τὸν γέροντα μ' ἐκ πάτρας. — δύναμις Θεοῦ] Comp. on Rom. i. 16. That doctrine is

¹ Bengel's ingenious exposition: “qui evangelium audire coepit, nec ut perditus nec ut salvus habetur, sed est quasi in

bivio, et *nunc* aut perit aut salvatur,” is wrecked on the word ἡμῖν, which the *audire coepit* does not suit.

to them (to their conscious experience) *God's power*, inasmuch, that is to say, as God works mightily in them through the saving tidings of the Crucified. The *contrast* is stronger than if it were σοφία Θεοῦ, and is also logically correct ; for δύναμις Θεοῦ necessarily presupposes the opposite of μωρία, because the power of God brings about enlightenment, repentance, sanctification, love, peace, hope, etc. Comp. Ignat. *ad Eph.* 18, where it is said of the cross, that it is to us σωτηρία κ. ζωὴ αἰώνιος.

Ver. 19. Establishment from Scripture of the foregoing τοῖς δὲ σωζομ. κ.τ.λ. : for were the word of the cross not *God's power* for the σωζόμενοι, God could not say of it in the Scriptures : " I will destroy," etc.—In the passage, Isa. xxix. 14 (a free quotation from the LXX., the difference between which and the original Hebrew is unessential), Paul, in accordance with the typical significance attendant on the historical sense,¹ recognizes a prediction of the powerful working of the doctrine of the cross as that through which God would bring to nought and do away with the wisdom of man, *i.e.* empty it of its estimation. The justification of this way of viewing it lay in the *Messianic character* of O. T. prophecy in general, by virtue of which the historical sense does not exhaust the design of the utterances, but leaves open higher references to the further development of the theocratic relations, and especially to the Messianic era, which references are to manifest themselves *historically* by the corresponding facts of later date, and so be recognized from the standpoint of their historical fulfilment. See more in detail, on Matt. i. 22 f. (c) Christ Himself confirms the Messianic reference of the prophetic utterance, Matt. xv. 8.—Regarding the distinction between σοφία and σύνεσις (*intelligence*), see on Col. i. 9.

Ver. 20. What this passage of Scripture promises, has occurred : *Where is a wise man*, etc. The force of these triumphant questions (comp. xv. 55, and see on Rom. iii. 27) is : *clean gone are all sages, scribes, and disputers of this world-period* (they can no more hold their ground, no longer assert themselves, have, as it were, vanished) ; *God has made the world's wisdom to be manifest folly!* As the passages, Isa. xix. 12, xxxiii. 18, were perhaps before the apostle's mind, the form of expression used rests probably on them. Comp. Rom. iii. 27, where ἐξεκλείσθη is the answer to the ποῦ ; according to classical usage, Valckenaer, *ad Eur. Phoen.* 1662. Ewald holds ver. 20 to be a citation from a lost book ; but we are not necessarily shut up to this conclusion by the γραμματεῖς, although the term does not occur elsewhere in Paul's writings, for this exclamation might easily have been suggested to him by the γραμματικοί of Isa. xxxiii. 18. *The three substantives* cannot well be taken as alluding to the synagogal phrases חכל ספר and דרשן (Lightfoot, Vitranga), since Paul was not writing to a purely Jewish-Christian community. Attempts to explain the distinction between them have been made in a variety of ways. But it is to be noted that in what immediately follows

¹ According to which the reference is not generally to the final catastrophe of the present state of things in Israel before the dawn of the Messianic period (Hofmann), but, as the context shows, to the *penal*

judgment under Sennacherib, in which the wisdom of the rulers and false prophets of Israel was to be confounded and left helpless.

τὴν σοφίαν represents all the three ideas put together ; that γραμματεὺς, again, is always (excepting Acts xix. 35) used in the N. T. (even in Matt. xiii. 52, xxiii. 34, where the idea is only raised to the Christian sphere) of scribes in the Jewish sense ; that the συζητήτης (Ignat. *ad Eph.* 18), which is not found in the Greek writers or in the LXX., is most surely interpreted *disputant*, in accordance with the use of συζητέω (Mark viii. 11, ix. 14 ; Luke xxiv. 15 ; Acts vi. 9, ix. 29, *al.*) and συζητήσεις (Acts xv. 2, 7, xxviii. 29) ; and further, that disputing was especially in vogue among the Sophists (οἱ οἰόμενοι πάντ' εἶδέναι, Xen. *Mem.* i. 4. 1). And on these grounds we conclude that σοφός is to be taken of human wisdom in general, as then pursued on the Jewish side by the scribes, and on the Hellenic side by the sophistical disputers, so that, in this view, γραμμ. and συζητ. are subordinated to the general σοφός in respect to matters of Jewish and Hellenic pursuit. Many exegetes (Chrysostom, Theodoret, Theophylact, Oecumenius, and others, including Storr, Rosenmüller, Flatt, Billroth) depart from the view now stated in this respect, that they would limit σοφός to the *heathen* philosophers,¹ which, however, is precluded by the σοφίαν embracing all the three elements (comp. also ver. 21). This holds at the same time against Rückert, who finds here only the three most outstanding features in the intellectual character of the Hellenes : cleverness, erudition, and argumentativeness. But ver. 22 shows that Paul is not shutting out the Jewish element ; just as his Jewish-Christian readers could see in γραμμ. nothing else than a name for the σοφοί of *their* people. Schrader, with older expositors (see below), understands by συζητ. an *inquirer*, and in a perfectly arbitrary way makes it refer partly to the pupils of the great training-schools of Alexandria, Athens, Jerusalem, etc. ; partly to the disciples of the apostles and of Jesus Himself. But συζητ. could only denote a *fellow-inquirer* (comp. συζητεῖν in Plat. *Men.* p. 90 B, *Crat.* p. 384 C ; Diog. L. ii. 22), which would be without pertinence here ; while, on the other hand, according to our view, the σύν finds its reference in the notion of *disputare*. — τοῦ αἰῶν. τούτου] attaches to all the three subjects : *who belong to the pre-Messianic period of the world* ("quod totum est extra sphaeram verbi crucis," Bengel), and are not, like the Christians, set apart by God from the υἱοὶ τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου to be members of the Messianic kingdom, in virtue whereof they already, ideally considered, belong to the coming αἰών. Comp. ver. 27 ; Gal. i. 4 ; Col. i. 13 ; Phil. iii. 20 ; Rom. xii. 2. Luther and many others take τοῦ αἰῶν. τ. as referring simply to συζητ. ; but wrongly, for it gives an *essential* characteristic of the first two subjects as well. Of those who think thus, some keep the true meaning of αἰὼν οὗτος (as Rückert and Billroth) ; others render : *indagator rerum naturae*, physical philosopher (Erasmus, Beza, Drusius, Cornelius à Lapide, Justiniani, Grotius, Clericus, and Valckenaer), which is quite contrary to the invariable sense of αἰὼν οὗτ. — ἐμώρπανε] emphatically put first : *made foolish*, i.e. from the context, not : He has made it into *incapacity of knowledge* (Hofmann), which would come in the end to the notion of *callousness*, but : He has *shown it practically to be*

¹ In consequence of this, συζητητής has been regarded as comprising the Jewish and heathen dialecticians. See especially Theodoret.

folly, “insaniens sapientia” (Hor. *Od.* i. 34. 2), σοφία ἄσοφος (Clem. *Protr.* V. p. 56 A), by bringing about, namely, the salvation of believers just through that which to the wise men of this world seemed foolishness, the preaching of the cross. See ver. 21. The more foolish, therefore, this preaching is in their eyes and according to their judgment, the more they themselves are exhibited as fools (as μωρόσοφοι, Lucian, *Alex.* 40), and put to shame (ver. 27), since the κήρυγμα, held by them to be *foolish*, is that which *brings salvation*, not indeed to them, but to those who *believe*; ποία γὰρ σοφία, ὅταν τὸ κεφάλαιον τῶν ἀγαθῶν μὴ εὐρίσκη; Chrysostom. Comp. Isa. xlv. 25, where μωραίνων is to be taken in precisely the same way as here. — τοῦ κόσμου] *i.e.* of profane non-Christian humanity, the two halves of which are the Jews and the heathen, vv. 22–24.

Ver. 21. More detailed explanation as to this ἐμώρανεν ὁ Θεὸς κ.τ.λ., specifying the *why* in the protasis and the *how* in the apodosis: *since* (see Hartung, *Partikell.* II. p. 259), *that is to say, in the wisdom of God the world knew not God through wisdom, it pleased God to save believers through the foolishness of preaching.* The wisdom of God was set before the eyes of the world, even of the heathen part of it, in the works of creation (Rom. i. 19 f.; comp. also Acts xvii. 26 f., xiv. 15 ff.); to the Jews it was presented, besides, in the revelation of the O. T. In this His manifested wisdom God might and should have been known by men; but they did not know Him therein (ἐν τῇ σοφ. τ. Θεοῦ οὐκ ἔγνω ὁ κόσμ. τ. Θεόν),—did not attain by the means which they employed, by their wisdom, namely (διὰ τῆς σοφίας), to this knowledge; whereupon God adopted the plan of saving (in the Messianic sense) believers through the opposite of wisdom, namely, through the foolishness of the gospel. — ἐν τῇ σοφία τ. Θεοῦ] is put first emphatically, because the whole *stress* of the antithesis in both protasis and apodosis is meant to fall on the notions of *wisdom* and *folly*. By ἐν Paul marks out the *sphere, in which* the negative fact of the οὐκ ἔγνω (“in media luce,” Calvin) took place; τοῦ Θεοῦ again is genitive *subjecti*, denoting, however, not the wisdom shown by God *in Christ* (Zachariae, Heydenreich, and Maier), nor Christ Himself even (Schrader and older expositors adduced by Estius), both of which would be quite unsuitable to the apodosis, but the wisdom of God manifested *before* Christianity in nature and Scripture.¹ Rückert is wrong in holding that ἐν τ. σοφ. τ. Θεοῦ is: “*in virtue of the wisdom of God, i.e. under its guidance and arrangement, the world knew not God through its own wisdom.*” Certainly Paul would not be made by this interpretation to say anything which would in itself be at variance with his view of the divine relationship to the matter; for with him the two factors of human action, the divine causality and the human self-determination, are so associated, that he may bring now the one and now the other into the foreground (comp. on Rom. ix.); but against it may be urged, partly the position of the words ἐν . . . Θεοῦ, which on Rückert’s view would lose their weight and convey a thought here unessential, and partly the signifi-

¹ Not simply in the *natural* revelation (Chrysostom, Calvin, Grotius, Estius; and many others, including Hofmann). For

ver. 22 proves that the Jews, too, are included with the rest in the notion of the κόσμος.

cant relation between the protasis and apodosis, according to which the measure taken by God (εὐδόκησεν κ.τ.λ.) appears as called forth by *men's* lack of knowledge, and hence the οὐκ ἔγνω would in such a passage be most unsuitably referred to the appointment of *God*, so as to excuse what is declared in Rom. i. 20 to be inexcusable. — οὐκ ἔγνω] Seeing that the Jews also are included, and that anything which would contradict Rom. i. 19–21 is out of the question, this must apply to the *true* knowledge of God, which was not attained, and which, if the κόσμος had reached it, would have caused the preaching of the cross to appear other than foolishness ; comp. ii. 14. — διὰ τῆς σοφ.] applies to the heathen *world-wisdom* and the Jewish *school-wisdom*, since it is the *means* of knowledge employed without result (observe that by the οὐκ *the whole* from ἔγνω to Θεόν *inclusive* is negatived) by the κόσμος for the knowing God. The *prepositional relation* cannot differ from that of the correlative διὰ τ. μωρίας which follows. Hence Theophylact interprets wrongly : διὰ τῆς ἐν εὐγλωττία θεωρουμένης σοφίας ἐμποδιζόμενοι. So, too, Billroth : “their own wisdom was the *cause* of their not knowing. — εὐδόκησεν ὁ Θεός.] *placuit Deo*, He pleased, it was His will, as Rom. xv. 26 ; Gal. i. 15 ; Col. i. 19 ; 1 Thess. ii. 8. See Fritzsche, *ad Rom.* II. p. 370. — διὰ τῆς μωρίας τοῦ κηρύγμ., *i.e.* by means of the foolishness which formed the substance of the preaching (of the gospel). That is the doctrine of the cross, ver. 18, which, as compared with the wisdom employed by the κόσμος as a means of knowledge, is a *foolish* doctrine, but in the counsel and work of God the means of salvation, namely, for the πιστεύοντας, which word, as solving the riddle of the divinely applied μωρία, stands emphatically at the end. For to the conscious experience of *believers* that resultless wisdom of the world is now *foolishness*, and the foolishness of the κήρυγμα the divine saving *wisdom*. — Notice, in conclusion, how the whole verse is a compact and stately co-ordination and dovetailing of correlative clauses. Remark, in particular, the repetition of σοφία and Θεός, “quasi aliquod telum saepius perveniat in eandem partem corporis,” *Auct. ad Herenn.* iv. 28.

Ver. 22 f.¹ Protasis (ἐπειδὴ) and apodosis (ἡμεῖς δέ) parallel to the protasis and apodosis in ver. 21 : *since as well Jews desire signs as Hellenes seek after wisdom, we, on the other hand, preach*, etc. It is to be observed how exactly the several members of the sentence correspond to what was said in ver. 21 ; for Ἰουδαῖοι κ. Ἕλληνες is just the notion of the κόσμος broken up ; σημεῖα αἰτοῦσι and σοφίαν ζητ. is the practical manifestation of the οὐκ ἔγνω . . . τὸν Θεόν ; and lastly, ἡμεῖς δὲ κηρύσσομεν κ.τ.λ. contains the actual way in which the εὐδόκησεν ὁ Θεός κ.τ.λ. was carried into effect. And to this carrying into effect belongs in substance Ἰουδαίοις μὲν σκάνδαλον κ.τ.λ. down to σοφίαν, ver. 24,—a consideration which disposes of the logical difficulty raised by Hofmann as to the causal relation of protasis and apodosis. — The correlation καὶ . . . καί includes not only the two *subjects* Ἰουδαῖοι and Ἕλληνες, but the two whole *affirmations* ; as well the one thing, that the Jews demand a sign, as the other, that the Gentiles desire philosophy, takes place. — ἡμεῖς

¹ Ver. 22 f. is the programme of the history of the development of Christianity in its conflict with the perverse fundamental ten-

dencies of the world's sensualism and spiritualism ; ver. 24, the programme of its triumph over both.

δέ] This δέ, *on the contrary, on the other hand*, is the common classical δέ of the apodosis (Acts xi. 17), which sets it in an antithetic relation corresponding to the protasis. See Hartung, *Partikell*, I. p. 184 f.; Baeumlein, *Partik.* p. 92 f.; Bornem. *Act. ap.* I. p. 77. Examples of this usage after ἐπεὶ and ἐπειδὴ may be seen in Klotz, *ad Devar.* p. 371 f. The parallel relation, which the eye at once detects, between ver. 21 and ver. 22 (and in which a rhetorical emphasis is given by the repetition of the ἐπειδὴ used by Paul only in xiv. 16, xv. 21; Phil. ii. 26, besides this passage), is opposed not merely to Billroth and Maier's interpretation, which makes ἐπειδὴ . . . ζητοῦσιν introduce a second protasis after εὐδόκ. ὁ Θεός, but also to Hofmann's, that vv. 22–24 are meant to explain the emphasis laid on τοὺς πιστεύοντας; as likewise to the view of Rückert and de Wette, that there is here added an explanation of the διὰ τῆς μωρίας κ.τ.λ., in connection with which Rückert arbitrarily imagines a μέν supplied after Ἰουδαῖοι. — Ἰουδαῖοι and Ἕλληνες without the article, since the statement is regarding what *such as are Jews*, etc., are wont, as a rule, to desire. — σημεῖα] Their desire is, that He on whom they are to believe should manifest Himself by *miraculous signs*, which would demonstrate His Messiahship (Matt. xvi. 4). They demand these, therefore, as a *ground of faith*; comp. John iv. 48. That we are not to understand here *miracles of the apostles* (Chrysostom, Theodoret, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Bengel, and others) is clear, both from the nature of the antithesis, and from the consideration that, in point of fact, the apostles did actually perform σημεῖα (Rom. xv. 18 f.; 2 Cor. xii. 12). What the Jews desired in place of these were miraculous signs by which the *crucified*, but, according to the apostles' teaching, *risen and exalted*, Jesus, should evince His being the Messiah, seeing that the miracles of His earthly life had for them lost all probative power through His crucifixion (Matt. xxvii. 41 f., 63 f.). Comp. Reiche, *Comment. crit.* I. p. 123 f. To take, with Hofmann, the σημεῖα αἰτ. generally, as a *universal Jewish* characteristic, of the tendency to crave acts of power that should strike the senses and exclude the possibility of doubt, is less suitable to the *definite* reference of the context to *Christ*, in whom they were refusing to believe. Were the reading σημεῖον (see the critical remarks) to be adopted, we should have to understand it of *some* miracle specifically accrediting the Messiahship; not, with Schulz, Valckenaer, Eichhorn, and Pott, of the illustrious *person of an earthly ruler*. Any such personal reference would need to be suggested by the connection, as in Luke ii. 34; but this is not at all the case in view of the parallel σοφίαν, nor is it so even by X. ἐσταυρ. in ver. 23. See on the latter verse. — αἰτοῦσι] is the *demand* actually uttered (that there be *given*); ζητοῦσι the seeking after and *desiring, anquirere* (correlative: εὐρίσκειν). — Χριστὸν ἐσταυρ.] *Christ as crucified* (ii. 2; Gal. iii. 1), and therefore neither as one who exhibits miraculous signs, nor as the originator of a new philosophy, such, possibly, as Socrates or Pythagoras. — σκάνδαλον] in opposition to X. ἐσταυρ. As *crucified*, He is to them an occasion for unbelief and rejection. Gal. v. 11. For His being put to a shameful death conflicts with the demand to have a Messiah glorified by miracles. — μωρίαν] because philosophy is what they desire as a guide to salvation; therefore to believe in Christ (not as one of

the wise of this world, but) as crucified, is to them a *folly*, an absurdity ; whereby, indeed, their own σοφία becomes μωρία παρὰ τ. Θεῷ, iii. 19.

Ver. 24. Along with Χριστόν, which is triumphantly repeated, we are mentally to supply κηρύσσομεν : *but to the called themselves . . . we preach Christ as God's power and God's wisdom—i.e.* our preaching of Christ as crucified makes such an impression upon them,¹ that they come to know in their experience the manifestation and the whole work of Christ as that whereby God powerfully works out salvation and reveals His counsel full of wisdom ; comp. ver. 30. Hofmann's construction, making Χριστόν to be *in apposition* to Χριστόν ἐσταυρ., would be logically correct only on one of two suppositions : either if in ver. 23 there stood *merely* ἐσταυρωμένον *without* Χριστόν ("a crucified one . . . who is to them Christ") ; or if, in ver. 24, some more precise definition, such as ὁντως or ἀληθῶς, were given along with Χριστόν. — αὐτοῖς] is not the *uis* pointing back to τοὺς πιστεύοντας, so that τοῖς κλητοῖς would be in *apposition* to it (Hofmann) ; for in that case, notwithstanding the harsh and distant retrospective reference, αὐτοῖς would in fact be entirely superfluous ; but the words αὐτοῖς δὲ τοῖς κλητοῖς—the αὐτοῖς being emphatically put first (2 Cor. xi. 14 ; Heb. ix. 23, *al.*, and very often in Greek writers)—go together as closely connected, and mean simply : *ipsis autem vocatis* (Vulg.), to the called *for their part, so far as they are concerned*, so that αὐτοῖς denotes the called *themselves* (Herm. *ad Vigér.* p. 733), in contrast to *those round about them* still remaining in unbelief (Ἰουδαίους . . . μωρίαν). Instead of τ. κλητοῖς, we might have had τοῖς πιστεύουσιν (ver. 21) ; but how natural it was that the Θεοῦ δύναμιν κ.τ.λ., which was present to the apostle's mind, should have led to his designating the subjects of his statement according to the *divine* qualification which applied to them. Comp. ver. 26. As to κλητός, see on ver. 2.² That Paul did not write ἡμῖν, is to be accounted for on the ground of its being unsuitable to the κηρύσσ., which is to be here again understood ; not, as Rückert thinks, because it seemed to him too hard to oppose ἡμ. to Ἰουδ. and ἔθνεσι. — Θεοῦ δύν. κ. θ. σοφ.] To *all* the κλητοί Christ is *both*. But the words are formally *parallel* to the two former demands in ver. 22 ; hence δύναμιν is put *first*. Respecting σοφίαν, comp. on ver. 30.

Ver. 25. Confirmation of the Θεοῦ δύν. κ. Θεοῦ σοφ. by a general proposition, the first half of which corresponds to the Θεοῦ σοφίαν, and the second to the Θεοῦ δύναμιν. — τὸ μωρὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ] *the foolish thing which comes from God*,³ *i.e.* what God works and orders, and which appears to men ab-

¹ For the preaching is not twofold, but one and the same, only spoken of in its respective relations to the two opposite classes of men. Comp. 2 Cor. ii. 16. That is the *crisis*, which the gospel brings about, and its influence on the called is to *make them free* (John viii. 33, 36 ; Rom. vi. 22).

² Comp. Clem. Alex. *Strom.* I. p. 314 (ed. Paris. 1641) : πάντων ἀνθρώπων κεκλημένων οἱ ὑπακοῦσαι βουληθέντες κλητοὶ ὠνομάσθησαν. These also are the σωζόμενοι, ver. 18 ; the opposite is the ἀπολλύμενοι.

³ This, according to the well-known use in Greek of the neuter with the genitive (Poppo, *ad Thuc.* VI. p. 168 ; Kühner, II. p. 122), might also be taken as abstract : *the foolishness of God—the weakness of God*. So τὸ μωρὸν, Eur. *Hipp.* 966. But Paul had the concrete conception in his mind ; otherwise he would most naturally have used the abstract μωρία employed just before. The meaning of the concrete expression, however, is not : *God Himself, in so far as He is foolish* (Hofmann) ; passages such as 2 Cor.

surd. Comp. τὸ σωτήριον τ. Θεοῦ, Luke ii. 30. — τῶν ἀνθρώπων] We are not to amplify this, with the majority of interpreters (including Beza, Grotius, Valckenaer, Zachariae, Flatt, Pott, Heydenreich, and de Wette), into τοῦ σοφοῦ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, after a well-known abbreviated mode of comparison (see on Matt. v. 20 ; John v. 36), which Estius rightly censures here as *coactum* (comp. Winer, p. 230 [E. T. 307]), because we should have to supply with τῶν ἀνθρ. not the last named attribute, but its opposite ; the true rendering, in fact, is just the simple one : *wiser than men* ; men possess less wisdom than is contained in the foolish thing of God. — τὸ ἀσθενὲς τοῦ Θεοῦ] whatever in God's appointments is, to human estimation, powerless and resultless. The concrete instance which Paul has in view when employing the general terms τὸ μωρόν and τὸ ἀσθενὲς τοῦ Θεοῦ, is the death of Christ on the cross, through which God has fulfilled the counsel of His eternal *wisdom*, wrought out with *power* the redemption of the world, laid the foundations of everlasting bliss, and overcome all powers antagonistic to Himself.

Ver. 26. Confirmation of this general proposition from the experience of the readers. The element of proof lies in the contrast, ver. 27 f. For if the matter were not as stated in ver. 25, then God would not have chosen the foolish of the world to put to shame its wise ones. By so doing He has, indeed, set before your eyes the practical experimental proof, that the μωρόν τοῦ Θεοῦ transcends men in wisdom. Otherwise He would have acted in the reverse way, and have sought out for Himself the *wise* of the world, in order, through their wisdom, to help that which now appears as the μωρόν τ. Θεοῦ to victory over the *foolishness* of the world. This holds, too, as against de Wette, who (comp. also Hofmann) makes γάρ refer to the whole series of thoughts, vv. 19–25, notwithstanding that the expressions here used attach themselves so distinctly to ver. 25. — βλέπετε] *imperative*. As such it has with logical correctness its hortatory emphasis ;¹ but not so, if we take it as *indicative* (Valla, Erasmus, Castalio, Beza, Vatablus, Bengel, Rosenmüller, and Schrader). — τὴν κλήσιν ὑμῶν] is not to be taken arbitrarily, with Beza, Estius, Mosheim, Semler, Rosenmüller, and Pott, *pro concreto*, for ὑμᾶς τοὺς κλητούς, but as : *your calling* (to salvation through the Messiah) ; see, what was the nature of it as regards the persons whom God, the caller, had chosen (ver. 27 ff.). Krause and Olshausen run counter to the specific Christian sense of the word, and even to the general linguistic usage (see on vii. 20), when they make it mean, like the German word “*Beruf*” [*calling*], the *vitae genus*, the outward circumstances. — ὅτι] equivalent to εἰς ἐκεῖνο, ὅτι, *in so far, namely, as*. Plat. *Prot.* p. 330 E, *Crat.* p. 384 C, *al.* John ii. 18, ix. 17, xi. 51 ; 2 Cor. i. 18, xi. 10 ; Mark xvi. 14 ; Fritzsche, *ad Matth.* p. 248 f. — οὐ πολλοὶ σοφοὶ κ. σ.] that *not many* (among you) *are wise in the eyes of men*, etc. It is enough to supply the simple εἰσί, making οὐ πολλ., i.e. *but few*, the subject, and σοφ. the predicate ; and there is

iv. 17, Rom. i. 19, ii. 4, viii. 3, are no proof of this.—As to the different accentuations of μωρός and μῶρος, see Lipsius, *grammat. Unters.* p. 25 ; Götting, *Accentl.* p. 304.

¹ The γάρ is not against our taking it as imperative ; Greek writers, too, use it with that mood, as *e.g.* Soph. *Phil.* 1043 : ἄφστε γὰρ αὐτόν.

no need for introducing an ἐκλήθησαν (so *commonly*), according to which οὐ π. σ. together would be the subject. Κατὰ σάρκα, specifying the kind and manner of the σοφία, marks it out as *purely human*, and distinguishes it from the *Christian* wisdom which proceeds from the Holy Spirit. For σάρξ comprises the simply human element in man as opposed to the divine principle. Comp. σοφία σαρκική, 2 Cor. i. 12 ; σοφία ψυχικ, Jas. iii. 15 ; and see on Rom. iv. 1 ; John iii. 6. Estius aptly remarks : “Significari vult sapientiam, quae studio humano absque doctrina Spir. sancti potest acquiri.” In substance, the σοφία τοῦ κόσμου, ver. 20, and the σ. τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου, ii. 6, are the same. — δυνατοί] We are not to supply κατὰ σάρκα here again ; for that was essentially requisite only with σοφοί, and Paul otherwise would have coupled it with the third word (comp. ver. 20). That *mighty men of this world* are meant, is *self-evident*. — ἐγγενεῖς] of *high descent*. Comp. Luke xix. 12 ; frequent in the classics.—Rückert objects that Paul, instead of proving the phenomenon recorded in ver. 26 to have proceeded from the divine wisdom, uses it as an argument for ver. 25, and so reasons in a circle. But this is without foundation. For that the phenomenon in question was a work of the divine wisdom, was to the Christian consciousness (and Paul was, of course, writing to *Christians*, who looked at it in the same light with himself) *a thing ascertained and settled*, which could be employed therefore *directly* to establish ver. 25 in conformity with experience.

Vv. 27, 28. Expanded (see τοῦ κόσμου and πᾶσα σάρξ, ver. 29) statement of the opposite : *No ; the foolish things of the world were what God chose out for Himself*, etc. The calling, ver. 26, was in truth just the result and the proof of the *election*. Comp. 1 Thess. i. 4 f. ; 2 Thess. ii. 13 f. ; Rom. viii. 30, ix. 23 f. — τὰ μωρὰ τοῦ κόσμου] *the foolish elements of the world* (mankind), *i.e.* those to whom earthly wisdom was a quite foreign thing, so that they were the simple among men. Comp. Matt. xi. 25. Many exegetes (including Theodoret, Luther, Grotius, Estius, Rosenmüller, Flatt, and Billroth) take the genitive as : *according to the judgment of the world*. Against this may be urged, partly, the very fact that when God chose to Himself the persons referred to, they too had not yet the higher wisdom, and consequently were not unwise merely *in the eyes of the world* ; and partly, as deciding the point, the following ἀσθ. and ἀγεν., for they were, it is plain, really (and not merely in the eyes of the world) weak and of mean origin. — The *neuters* (comp. on the *plural*, Gal. iii. 22) indicate the category generally, it being evident from the context that what is meant is the *persons* included under that category. See generally, Winer, p. 167 [E. T. 222], and the same usage among classical writers in Blomfield, *ad Aesch. Pers. Gloss.* 101. — ἵνα τ. σ. κατασχ.] *design*. The nothingness and worthlessness of their wisdom were, to their shame, to be brought practically to light (by God’s choosing not them, but the unwise, for honour), no matter whether they themselves were conscious of this putting of them to shame or not. — The *thrice-repeated* ἐξελ. ὁ Θεός, beside the three contrasts of σοφοί, δυνατοί, and ἐγγενεῖς ver. 26), carries with it a triumphant emphasis. — τὰ μὴ ὄντα] The contrast to ἐγγενεῖς is brought out by three steps forming a climax. This third phrase is the strongest of all, and sums up powerfully the two foregoing ones by way of apposition

(hence without *καί*) : the *non-existent*, i.e. what was as utterly *worth nothing* as if it had not existed at all (Winer, p. 451 [E. T. 608]). · Comp. Eur. *Hec.* 284 : ἦν πότ', ἀλλὰ νῦν οὐκ εἴμ' ἔτι. Dem. 248. 25 ; Plat. *Crit.* p. 50 B ; and Stallbaum thereon. The subjective negation *μή* is quite according to rule (Bacumlein, *Partik.* p. 296), since the participle with the article expresses a generic notion ; and there is no need of importing the idea of an *untrue* although *actual* existence (Hofmann). We are not therefore to supply *τι* to τὰ ὄντα (as if *μηδὲν εἶναι* had been used before), but to explain it : *the existent*, what through repute, fortune, etc., is regarded as *that which is* (κατ' ἐξοχήν). Comp. Pflugk, *ad Hec. l.c.* : “ ipsum verbum *εἶναι* eam vim habet, ut significet in aliquo numero esse, rebus secundis florere.” — κατηγο.] Not *καταισχ.* again, because the notions *μὴ εἶναι* and *εἶναι* required a stronger word to correspond to them ; one which would convey the idea of *bringing to nought* (i.e. *making worthless*, Rom. iii. 31).

Ver. 29. Final aim, to which is subordinated the mediate aim expressed by the thrice-repeated *ἵνα κ.τ.λ.* — ὅπως μὴ *καυχ.* πᾶσα *σάρξ*] Hebraistic way of saying : *that no man may boast himself*. Its explanation lies in the fact that the negation belongs to the verb, not to πᾶσα σ. (לֹא-יִשְׁתַּכַּח) : *that every man may abstain from boasting himself*. Comp. Fritzsche, *Diss. in 2 Cor. II.* p. 24 f. Regarding *σάρξ* as a designation of man in his weakness and imperfection as contrasted with God, see on Acts iii. 17. — ἐνώπ. τ. Θεοῦ] Rom. iii. 20 ; Luke xvi. 15, *al.* No one is to come forth *before God* and boast, I am wise, etc. ; on this account God has, by choosing the unwise, etc., brought to nought the wisdom and loftiness of men, so that the ground for the assertion of human excellences before God has been cut away.

Ver. 30 f. In contrast (δέ) to the ὅπως μὴ *καυχ.* π. σ. ἐνώπιον τ. Θεοῦ, we have now the true relation to God and the true and right *καυχᾶσθαι* arising out of it : *But truly it is God's work, that ye are Christians and so partakers of the greatest divine blessings, that none of you should in any way boast himself save only in God*. Comp. Eph. ii. 8 f. — ἐξ αὐτοῦ] has the principal emphasis : *From no other than God is derived the fact that you are in Christ* (as the element of your life). 'Εξ denotes the causal origination. Comp. Eph. ii. 8 : οὐκ ἐξ ὑμῶν, Θεοῦ τὸ δῶρον, also in profane writers : ἐκ θεῶν, ἐκ Διός (Valckenaer, *ad Herod.* ii. 13) ; and generally, Winer, p. 345 [E. T. 460]. While Hofmann here, too, as in ver. 28, introduces into *εἶναι* the notion of the *true existence*, which they have from God “in virtue of their being included in Christ,” others again, following Chrysostom, Theodoret, and Theophylact, take ἐξ αὐτοῦ δὲ ὑμεῖς ἐστε by itself in such a way as to make it express *sonship with God* (comp. Ellendt, *Lex. Soph.* I. p. 553), and regard ἐν as conveying the more precise definition of the mode whereby this sonship is attained : παῖδες αὐτοῦ ἐστε, διὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦτο γενόμενοι, Chrysostom ; comp. Calvin, Beza, Grotius, Flatt, Billroth, Rückert, Ewald, and others. But wrongly ; for the conception ἐκ Θεοῦ *εἶναι* in the supposed sense is Johanneine, but is not in accordance with the Pauline mode of expression (not even in Gal. iv. 4) ; and *εἶναι ἐν Χριστῷ* was a conception so habitually in use (Rom. xvi. 7, 11 ; 2 Cor. v. 17 ; Gal. i. 22, *al.*), that it must have occurred of itself here also to the reader ; besides, the ἀπὸ Θεοῦ which follows answers

to the ἐξ αὐτοῦ. This applies, too, against Osiander, who, after ἐξ αὐτοῦ, mentally supplies γεγεννημένοι: “being born of God, ye are members of Christ.” — ὑμεῖς] with emphasis: *ye* for your part, ye the chosen out of the world. — ὅς ἐγενήθη . . . ἀπολύτρωσις] brings home to the heart the high value of that God-derived εἶναι ἐν Χριστῷ: *who has become to us from God wisdom, righteousness and holiness, and redemption.* Ἐγενήθη is simply a later (Doric) form for ἐγένετο (Thom. Mag. p. 189; Lobeck, *ad Phryn.* p. 108 f.), not, as Rückert makes it (comp. Luther: “gemacht ist”), a true *passive in sense*; comp. Acts iv. 4; Col. iv. 11; 1 Thess. ii. 14 (Eph. iii. 7, Lachm.). *Christ became to us wisdom, etc.*, inasmuch as His manifestation and His whole saving work have procured for believers these blessings; namely, first of all,—what was of primary importance in the connection of ver. 19 ff.,—*wisdom*, for to believers is revealed the counsel of God, in whom are all treasures of wisdom and knowledge (see ii. 7 ff.; Col. ii. 3); *righteousness*, for by means of faith we are through the Lord’s atoning death constituted righteous before God (Rom. iii. 24 f., *al.*; see on Rom. i. 17; *holiness* (see on Rom. vi. 19, 22), for in those who are justified by faith Christ works continually by His Spirit the new holy life (Rom. viii. 1–11); *redemption*, for Christ has delivered believers, through His blood paid as their ransom (Rom. iii. 24, vi. 20, vii. 23), from the wrath of God, to which they were subject before the entrance of faith (see on Eph. i. 7, ii. 3). The *order* in which these predicates stand is *not illogical*; for after the first *intellectual* benefit (σοφία) which we have received in Christ, marked out too from the rest by the position of the word, Paul brings forward the *ethical* blessedness of the Christian, and that in the first place *positively* as δικαιοσύνη and ἁγιασμός, but then also—as though in triumph that there was now nothing more to fear from God—*negatively* as ἀπολύτρωσις, in which is quenched all the wrath of God against *former* sin (instead of which with the Christian there are now righteousness and holiness). Hence in explaining ἀπολύτρ. we should not (with Chrysostom) abide by the general ἀπήλλαξεν ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν κακῶν, which is already contained in what goes before; nor again should we, with Grotius, Calovius, Rückert, Osiander, Neander, and others (comp. also Schmid, *bibl. Theol.* II. p. 325; and Lipsius, *Paulin. Rechtfertigungslehre*, p. 8), make it *the final redemption from death and all evils*, such as is the object of ἐλπίς, the redemption *perfecting* itself *beyond* our earthly life (Hofmann), or the *definitive* acquittal at the last *judgment* (Weiss, *Bibl. Theol.* p. 327). In the passages alleged to support the interpretation in question, this sense is given solely by the accessory defining phrases—namely, in Eph. i. 14 by τῆς περιποιήσεως, in iv. 30 by ἡμέραν, and in Rom. viii. 23 by τοῦ σώματος. Rückert (comp. Neander) is further of opinion that δικαιοσύνη κ.τ.λ. is merely *explanatory* of *how far* Christ is to us σοφία, namely, as δικαιοσύνη, ἁγιασμός, and ἀπολύτρ., and that these three refer to the three essential things in the Christian life, faith, love, and hope: the τέ binding together the last three words and separating them from the first. But (1) the τέ links closely together only δικαιοσ. and ἁγιασμ., and does not include ἀπολ.; much less does it separate the three last predicates from σοφία;¹ on the contrary, τε καί embraces δικ.

¹ With σοφία the τέ has nothing whatever to do. Hofmann makes it serve as a link

and ἀγ., as it were, in one, so that then ἀπολύτρωσις comes to be added with the adjunctive καί as a separate element, and consequently there results the following division : (a) wisdom, (b) righteousness and holiness, and (c) redemption. See as to this use of τε καί . . . καί, Hartung, *Partikell.* I. p. 102 ; Ellendt, *Lex. Soph.* I. p. 878 f. ; Baeumlein, *Partik.* p. 224 f. (2) Paul would, on this theory, have left his readers without the slightest hint of the subordinate relation of the three last predicates to the first, although he could so easily have indicated it by a ὡς or a participle. (3) According to the correct interpretation, ἀπολύτρ. is not something yet *future*, but something which has *already taken place* in the death of Christ. (D) Bos (*Obs. Misc.* p. 1 ff.), Alethius, Clericus, Nösselt (*Opusc.* II. p. 127 ff.), Valckenaer, and Krause interpret in a still more involved way, holding that only the words from ὅς to Θεοῦ apply to Christ, and these are to be put in a parenthesis ; while δικαιοσύνη κ.τ.λ. are *abstracta pro concretis* (2 Cor. v. 21), and belong to ὑμεῖς ἐστε : “Ejus beneficio vos estis in Christo Jesu δικαιοσυνή κ.τ.λ.,” Valckenaer. How ambiguous and unsuitable would such a statement as ὅς ἐγεν. σοφία κ.τ.λ. be for a mere parenthetical notice ! — ἀπὸ Θεοῦ] *on God's part*, by God as the author of the fact. Comp. Herod. vi. 125 : ἀπὸ δὲ Ἀλκμαίωνος . . . ἐγένοντο καὶ κάρτα λαμπροί. See generally, Ellendt, *Lex. Soph.* I. p. 194 ; Winer, p. 348 [E. T. 464] ; Buttmann, *neut. Gr.* p. 280 [E. T. 325]. That it belongs to ἐγενήθη, and not to σοφία, is proved by the ἡμῖν which stands between. The latter, however, is not to be understood, with Rückert, as though it ran ἡ ἡμετέρα σοφία (“what to the Hellene his σοφία is, or is merely assumed to be, namely, the ground of confidence,—that Christ is to us”), else Paul must have written : ὅς ἡμῖν ἐγενήθη ἡ σοφία with the article, and have placed ἡμῖν first with the emphasis of contrast.—Observe further, that Paul has said ὑμεῖς with his eye still, as in ver. 26, upon the church to which his readers belonged ; but now, in adducing the blessings found in Christ, he extends the range of his view to all Christians ; and hence, instead of the individualizing ὑμεῖς, we have the ἡμῖν including himself and others.

Ver. 31. The fact that *God* is the author of your connection with Christ, and thereby of the blessings you receive as Christians (ver. 30), should, according to the divine purpose (*ἵνα*), determine you to comply with that word of Scripture which calls for the true lowly *καυχᾶσθαι* : *he that boasteth himself, let him boast himself in the Lord*, praise his own privileges only as God's work, boast himself only as the object of His grace.—That the Κύριος is not Christ (Rückert) but *God*, and not Christ *and* God (Hofmann), is proved by the emphatic ἐξ αὐτοῦ, ver. 30, and ἐνώπ. τ. Θεοῦ, ver. 29. Comp. on 2 Cor. x. 17.—The apostle *quotes* Jer. ix. 24, abbreviating quite freely, after the LXX. The *construction*, however, is *anacoluthic* ; for Paul purposely retains the scriptural saying unaltered in its strong imperative form, and leaves it to the reader to supply the change from the imperative to the subjunctive, which the syntax, properly speaking, would require. Comp. on Rom. xv. 3.

of connection to σοφία. In that case, Paul must have written σοφία τε καὶ δικαιοσ. κ. ἀγ. κ. ἀπολ.

NOTES BY AMERICAN EDITOR.

(A) *The factions.* Vv. 11-13.

On the subject contained in these verses Dean Stanley makes the following edifying reflections: "It is by catching a glimpse, however partial, of the wild dissensions which raged around and beneath the apostolical writings, that we can best appreciate the unity and repose of those writings themselves; it is by seeing how completely these dissensions have been obliterated, that we can best understand how marked was the difference between their results and those of analogous divisions in other history. We know how the names of Plato and Aristotle, of Francis and Dominic, of Luther and Calvin, have continued as the rallying point of rival schools and systems long after the decease, and contrary even to the intentions of the respective founders. But with regard to the factions of the Apostolic age it was not so. The schools of Paul and Apollos and Kephass, which once waged so bitter a warfare against each other, were extinguished almost before ecclesiastical history had begun; and the utmost diversity of human character and outward style has been unable to break the harmony in which their memories are united in the associations of the Christian world. Partly this arose from the nature of the case. The Apostles could not have been the founders of systems, even if they would. Their power was not their own, but another's: 'Who made them to differ from another? What had they which they had not received?' If once they claimed an independent authority, their authority was gone. Great philosophers, great conquerors, great heresiarchs, leave their names even in spite of themselves. But such the Apostles could not be without ceasing to be what they were; and the total extinction of the parties which were called after them is in fact a testimony to the divinity of their mission. And it is difficult not to believe that in the great work of reconciliation, of which the outward volume of the Sacred Canon is the chief monument, they were themselves not merely passive instruments, but active agents; that a lesson is still to be derived from the record they have left of their own resistance to the claims of the factions which vainly endeavoured to divide what God had joined together."

(B) "*Being saved.*" Ver. 18.

The English translator rendered the Greek phrase here, "those who are being saved." But this is not required by the German original, and besides is objectionable in itself. In the first place, it is awkward and to many persons questionable English. In the next place, it is not required by the verbal form. The passive participle of the present tense is often used to express a completed action. (See Acts xx. 9; Heb. vii. 8; 2 Peter ii. 4, and 2 John 7.) In the last mentioned we have the present participle used to express the very same thing that in 1 John iv. 2 is expressed by a perfect participle: It is not denied that the present passive participle often denotes a continued state or a lengthened process (as in the description of the ancient saints, Heb. xi. 37, as "destitute, afflicted, evil entreated"), but it is claimed that this is not the habitual or necessary meaning. The context or the general usage of Scripture, or the nature of the subject, must determine the precise

meaning in any given case. In the LXX. the present passive and the perfect passive participle of the verb $\sigma\delta\zeta\omega$ are used as precisely equivalent. (Compare Jer. xlv. 14 with xlii. 7, and Isaiah xlv. 20 with lxvi. 19.)

But the chief objection to the proposed rendering is that it introduces a conception which does not belong to the New Testament, and, so far as it can, obliterates what is a marked peculiarity of the scriptural mode of conceiving of salvation, viz. that it is at once present and future. Which of these views is intended depends upon the circumstances in each case. On one hand, salvation is spoken of as to be realized in the day when Christ shall come. So 1 Peter i. 9, "Receiving the end of your faith, even the salvation of your souls"; Rom. viii. 24, "We are saved in hope, but hope that is seen is not hope"; 1 Cor. v. 5, "That the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus"; Matt. x. 22, "He that endureth to the end shall be saved." It is therefore quite certain that salvation in its full meaning, as extending to the body as well as the soul, as including inward holiness as well as forensic justification, as putting an end to sin and sorrow, vicissitude and temptation, tears and death, is experienced only when Christ shall appear a second time, apart from sin, to them that wait for him unto salvation (Heb. ix. 28). But, on the other hand, it is beyond doubt that the Scripture frequently speaks of salvation as a present possession of the believer. Thus in Luke vii. 50 our Lord is represented as saying to the penitent outcast who bathed his feet with tears and wiped them with the hair of her head, "Thy faith hath saved thee." So Paul says (Titus iii. 5), "According to his mercy he saved us" (cf. 2 Tim. i. 9). And Peter (1, iii. 21) says of baptism, "which also after a true likeness doth now save you." However men may explain this variant usage of Scripture writers, the fact of the variation should not be elided or obscured. Nor should the plain teaching of the Bible be denied which constantly affirms of men that they are either saved or lost, no third or intermediate condition being conceivable, any more than a departed spirit can be one half in heaven and the other half in hell. There may be gradual approaches to the act of faith, or even a long preparation for it, but the act itself is instantaneous. To speak of salvation, therefore, as a process, although the term is susceptible of a meaning which is correct, is to run the risk of misleading persons by inducing them to take up an opinion which is not at all correct, but unscriptural and dangerous.

(c) *Quotations.* Ver. 19.

The statement here is certainly correct, and is of great importance in explaining the method in which the words of the Old Testament are quoted in the New. It is from forgetfulness of the unity of Scripture and the preparatory character of the earlier economy that so many have charged the Apostle with wresting the prophetic utterances—that is, giving them a meaning which was never intended by the original speaker. It is true in several senses that "the testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy." The Bible's chief and salient feature is that it is, from first to last, the history of redemption, and all its parts, however diverse in tone and character, are bound together by their common relation to the one central and controlling thought, the promise of a world-wide deliverer. One of Meyer's great excellences is that he thoroughly and consistently recognizes this fact.

(D) “*Christ made unto us wisdom from God.*” Ver. 30.

The rendering of this verse to which the author objects may be seen by taking the words of the Revised Version, inserting the margin in the text, thus, “Christ Jesus, who was made unto us wisdom from God, both righteousness and sanctification and redemption.” Dr. Meyer’s objections certainly have weight, but they do not seem conclusive. The order of the words in the original, the stress which Paul lays on wisdom throughout the chapter, and the striking contrast thus gained, confirm the view that the three latter nouns are epexegetical of the first and are intended to disclose the glorious characteristics of the wisdom which is from God as distinguished from the wisdom which is of human origin. So Dr. Poor (in Lange), Archer Butler (in Sermons), Canon Evans (in Speaker’s Commentary), Principal Brown (in Popular Commentary), Beet (in Com.), and, substantially, Dean Stanley. Dr. Poor justly insists that in a collocation of words so peculiar, it is natural to take the last three words as an afterthought exegetical of the main one — and such an addition was needed. Wisdom was what Paul had been disparaging throughout this section. But it was the wisdom of man. Now he glories in Christ as having been made unto us wisdom. It was necessary therefore to difference this from what he had been condemning. So he adds *from God*, thus showing whence this wisdom came. Then to characterize it, to exhibit its distinguishing peculiarities as practical and suited for man’s deepest needs, instead of being merely speculative, he subjoins the three great points it contemplated. And here is where the wisdom of the Gospel far surpasses that of secular philosophy. Here, then, Dr. Poor concludes, we have, 1, an adequate reason for the order of the words ; 2, not a repetition, but a distinct thought in ἀπὸ Θεοῦ, and so a reason for the change of the preposition from the one in the first clause ; 3, not a digression from the main course of thought, as must be supposed in the other interpretation, but a glorious consummation of it, displaying the infinite superiority of the wisdom from God over all human wisdom ; 4, an epexegetis quite in the manner of Paul (Rom. i. 12).

CHAPTER II.

Ver. 1. μαρτύριον] A C $\aleph^*$, min. Syr. Copt. and some Fathers : *μυστήριον*. Approved by Griesb. and Ewald, adopted also by Rückert. A gloss written on the margin from ver. 7. Had μαρτύριον crept in from i. 6, the witnesses which have it would read also τοῦ Χριστοῦ instead of τ. Θεοῦ ; but this occurs only in very few, some of which, besides, have *μυστήριον*. — Ver. 2. τὸ εἰδέναι] Elz. τοῦ εἰδέναι τι. But τοῦ is wanting in decisive witnesses ; that τι should be put first is rendered certain by B C, min. Bas. Cyr. Isid. Chrys. Hil. Victorin. Aug., also D E (which have τὸ ἐν ὑμῖν εἰδέναι) ; and the external attestation must decide here. — Ver. 3. καὶ ἐγώ] Lachm. and Rückert read *κἀγώ*, with A B C $\aleph$, min. Or. Bas. *al.* Taken from ver. 1. — Ver. 4. After πειθοῖς Elz. has ἀνθρωπίνης, against preponderating evidence. Addition from vv. 5 and 13. In reply to Heydenreich's unfounded defence of the word, see Reiche, *Comment. crit.* I. p. 134. — The readings which alter πειθοῖς (πειθοῖ : 1, 18*, 48, *al.* Or. Eus. *al.* ; πειθανοῖς, Macar.), and those which either leave out λόγους (F G, 74, *al.* Erp. Boern. Ambrosiast. Sedul.) or alter it (λόγων : Syr. Armen. Or. twice over, and several others : λόγον), are old shifts resorted to on failure to understand πειθοῖς, as also the short reading ἐν πειθο σοφίας must be so accounted. See the exegetical remarks, and Reiche, p. 133. — Ver. 7. The order of the words Θεοῦ σοφίαν (Elz. and Matth. invert it) is decisively attested, as also the order in ver. 10 : ἀπεκάλ. ὁ Θεός. — Ver. 9. In place of the second ἃ, Lachm. and Tisch. have ὅσα, with A B C and some Fathers.¹ Rightly ; ἃ is a mechanical repetition from what goes before. — Ver. 10. Instead of δέ Tisch. reads γάρ, supported only by B, min. Copt. Sahid. Clem. — αὐτοῦ] is wanting in A B C $\aleph$, Copt. Clem. Bas. Cyr. It is deleted by Lachm. and Rückert. But considering the independent τὸ γὰρ πνεῦμα which follows, it would have been more natural to omit αὐτοῦ or to add ἁγίου (so Didym.) than to insert αὐτοῦ. — Ver. 11. ἐγνώκεν is, in accordance with the vast preponderance of evidence, approved by Griesb. and adopted by Lachm. Tisch. and Rückert. Elz., however, Matth. and Scholz, have οἶδεν. Repetition of the preceding οἶδεν done mechanically or by way of gloss. In favour of ἐγνώκεν there is also the reading ἐγνώ in F G, 23, and Fathers. — Ver. 13. πνεύματος] Elz. adds ἁγίου, against decisive evidence to the contrary. A superfluous and weakening definition. — Ver. 15. The μέν after ἀνακρ. in Elz. and Scholz (deleted by Lachm. Tisch. and Rück.) is wanting in A C D* F G, 17, and many vss. and Fathers. It has arisen from the δέ which follows. In $\aleph^*$ the whole verse is omitted through Homoioteleuton. $\aleph^{**}$ has μέν. — τὰ πάντα] so also Rück. and Tisch. ; Lachm. brackets τὰ ; Elz. and Scholz have simply πάντα. But τὰ is attested by A C D, min. Ir. ms. Or. Nyss. Chrys. ; πάντα is an old correction of the text, with the view of bringing in the mascu-

¹ Clement, too, *Cor.* I. 34, has ὅσα, which certainly was not first imported from his quotation into that of the apostle (Hof-

mann). A converse proceeding on the part of the transcribers might rather seem more natural.

line to correspond with the οὐδενός which comes after; hence, too, Didym. and Theodoret have πάντας. — Ver. 16. Χριστοῦ] Lachm. has Κυρίου, with B D* F G, Theophyl. Ambrosiast. Aug. Sedul. Mechanical repetition of the preceding Κυρίου. Had Κυρίου been the original reading and explained by a gloss, the substitute for it would have been not Χριστοῦ, but Θεοῦ, seeing that every marginal annotator must have been aware from Isa. xl. 13 that the preceding Κυρίου referred to God.

Vv. 1–5. *Application of the foregoing section (i. 17–31) to the manner in which Paul had come forward as a teacher in Corinth.*

Ver. 1. Κἀγώ] *I too*, as is the duty, in accordance with the previous explanation (i. 17–31), of every preacher of the gospel. The construction is such, that καθ' ὑπεροχὴν κ.τ.λ. belongs to καταγγ., as indicating the mode adopted in the καταγγέλλειν : *I too, when I came to you, brethren, came proclaiming to you, not upon the footing of a pre-eminence of speech (eloquence) or wisdom (philosophy), the testimony of God.* Against connecting the words in this way,¹ it is objected that ἐλθὼν ἦλθον gives an intolerable tautology. But this is of no weight (see the passages in Bernhardt, p. 475; Bornemann, *ad Cyrop.* v. 3. 2; Sauppe, *ad Anab.* iv. 2. 21; comp. on Acts vii. 34), and would, besides, apply to the construction ἦλθον οὐ . . . σοφίας, καταγγέλλων (Luther, Erasmus, Calvin, Grotius, and others, including Flatt, Rückert, Hofmann); further, it is more natural and more in accordance with the sense to think in connection with καθ' ὑπεροχὴν κ.τ.λ. of the manner of the *preaching* than of the manner of the *coming*. For that reason, too, ἦλθον is not placed after σοφίας. The preposition κατά, again, to express *mode* (Winer, p. 375 [E. T. 501]), is quite according to rule; comp. καθ' ὑπερβολήν, κατὰ κράτος, and the like. — As to ὑπεροχή, *eminentia*, comp. 1 Tim. ii. 2; Plat. *Legg.* iv. p. 711 D; Def. 416; Arist. *Pol.* iv. 9. 5. Also κακῶν ὑπεροχή, 2 Macc. xiii. 6. — καταγγέλλων] Paul might have used the future, but the *present* participle places the thing more vividly before us as already begun with the ἦλθον. So especially often ἀγγέλλων (Valck. *ad Phoen.* 1082); e.g. Xen. *Hell.* ii. 1. 29 : ἐς τὰς Ἀθήνας ἐπλευσεν, ἀγγέλλουσα τὰ γεγوناτα, Plat. *Phaed.* p. 116 C, and Stallbaum *in loc.* See, in general, Winer, p. 320 f. [E. T. 429 f.]; Dissen, *ad Pindar. Ol.* vii. 14. — τὸ μαρτύρ. τοῦ Θεοῦ] in substance not different from τ. μαρτ. τ. Χριστοῦ, i. 6; 2 Tim. i. 8. For the preachers of the gospel give *testimony of God*, as to what He has done, namely, in Christ for the salvation of men. Comp. xv. 15. In accordance with i. 6, the genitive is not, with Calvin, Bengel, Osiander, and Hofmann, to be taken subjectively, as in 1 John v. 9 f.

Ver. 2. *For I did not resolve* (did not set it before me as part of my undertaking) *to know anything among you except Jesus Christ, and that the crucified, i.e. to mix up other kinds of knowledge with the proclamation of Jesus Christ, etc.*² Had Paul not disdained this and not put aside all other

¹ Which is done also by Castalio, Bengel, and others, Pott, Heydenreich, Schrader, de Wette, Osiander, Ewald.

² Causaubon remarks well, that Ἰησ. Χ. refers to the *person*, and κ. τοῦτ. ἐστὼν. to

the *officium*, and “in his duobus totum versatur evangelium.” But the strong emphasis on the latter point arises from looking back to i. 17–24.

knowledge, his καταγγέλλειν would not have remained free from ὑπεροχὴ λόγου ἢ σοφίας. The ordinary reference of the negation to τι : *I resolved to know nothing*, etc., is in arbitrary opposition to the words (so, however, Pott, Flatt, Rückert, Osiander, Ewald). In ἐκρίνα Calvin and Grotius find too much, since the text does not give it : *magnum duxi* ; Hofmann again, too little, with Luther and others : *I judged, was of opinion* ; for Paul could indeed discard and negative in his own case the *undertaking* to know something, but not the *judgment* that he did know something. His *self-determination* was, not to be directed to know, etc. Comp. vii. 37 ; 2 Cor. ii. 1 ; Rom. xiv. 13 ; Κρίναί τι καὶ προθέσθαι, Polyb. iii. 6. 7 ; Wisd. viii. 9 ; 1 Macc. xi. 33 ; 2 Macc. vi. 14, *al.* He *might* have acted otherwise, had he *proposed* to himself to do so. — τὸ εἰδέναι] πρὸς ἀντιδιαστολὴν τῆς ἔξωθεν εἰρηται σοφίας· οὐ γὰρ ἦλθον συλλογισμοὺς πλέκων, οὐδὲ σοφίσματα, οὐδ' ἄλλο τι λέγων ὑμῖν, ἢ ὅτι ὁ Χριστὸς ἐσταυρώθη, Chrysostom. But the giving up of everything else is far more powerfully expressed by εἰδέναι (comp. Arrian, *Epict.* ii. 1) than if Paul had said λέγειν or λαλεῖν. He was not disposed, when among the Corinthians, to be *conscious* of anything else but Christ. The notion of *permission* (Rückert), which might be conveyed in the relation of the infinitive to the verb (see Lobeck, *ad Phryn.* p. 753 ; Kühner, *ad Xen. Mem.* ii. 2. 1 ; *Anab.* v. 7. 34), would here only weaken the force of the statement. Were τοῦ εἰδέναι τι the correct reading (but see the critical remarks), the right rendering of the genitive would not be : *so that* (Billroth), but : *I made no resolution, in order to know anything*. Comp. on Acts xxvii. 1. — κ. τοῦτ. ἐσταυρ.] notwithstanding the offence therein implied for Jew and Gentile, i. 18, 23. Comp. Gal. vi. 14.

Vv. 3, 4. After the proof given in ver. 2, Paul takes up again the connection of ver. 1, and that with the simple καί : *And I* for my part (with others it may have been different !) *fell into weakness and into much fear and trembling among you* (πρὸς ὑμ. ; see on John i. 1). — γίγνεσθαι ἐν, to fall into a state, etc. (and to be in it) ; so Thuc. i. 78. 1 ; Plato, *Prot.* p. 314 C ; Dem. p. 179, *ult.* Comp. Luke xxii. 44 ; 1 Macc. i. 27 ; 2 Macc. vii. 9 ; Hist. Sus. 8. We might also join πρὸς ὑμᾶς to ἐγενόμην, not, indeed, in the way in which Hofmann interprets it, as if for ἐγενόμην there stood ἡμην (Mark xiv. 49), but in the sense : *I arrived among you* (2 John 12, and see generally, Fritzsche, *Ind. ad Lucian. Dial. Deor.* p. 85 ; Nägelsbach on the *Iliad*, p. 295, ed. 3) ; ver. 4, however, shows that what is here spoken of is not again (ver. 1) the *coming thither*, but the state *when there*. — The three phrases, ἀσθ., φόβος, and τρόμος, depict the *great timidity* with which Paul was in Corinth, through his humble sense of the disproportion between his own powers and the great enterprise to which his conscientiousness kept him bound. In facing it he felt himself very *weak*, and was in *fear* and *trembling*. As for want of natural strength of will and determination, of which Hofmann speaks, there were no signs of anything of the kind in Paul, even judging from his experience at Athens ; and no such weakness betrays itself in Acts xviii. 4–11. The connection forbids us from thinking, with Chrysostom, Theodoret, Theophylact, Erasmus, Cornelius à Lapide, Grotius, and others, of the sufferings and persecutions (ἀσθ.), and of the apprehen-

sion of dangers, which he had to undergo in Corinth ; for the text hints nothing of persecutions and dangers, and these would not necessarily furnish the motive for simplicity in preaching (vv. 1, 4 f.), nay, might even excite to the greater rhetorical exertion. The weakness, etc., was of a deep ethical nature, being based on the entire renunciation of human wisdom and strength (ver. 5). Other exegetes wrongly understand ἀσθενεία even of *bodily* weakness, either generally *sickness* (Rückert) or more especially *weakness in the chest and voice* (Storr, comp. Rosenmüller). — φόβος κ. τρόμος] always denote with Paul (comp. also Ps. ii. 11) the deeply vivid and keen apprehension of humility, lest it should be unable to meet the emergency concerned. See 2 Cor. vii. 15 ; Phil. ii. 12 ; Eph. vi. 5. — ὁ λόγος μου κ. τ. κήρυγμά μου] are indeed emphatically separated from each other by the repetition of the μου ; but it is an arbitrary distinction to make the former of the two refer to the *form*, the latter to the *contents* (Heydenreich), or the former to the *privata*, the latter to the *publica institutio* (so Rückert and the majority of commentators). The former is the more general expression, the latter the particular : *my speech* generally (comp. 2 Cor. x. 10), and especially *my public proclamation*. — οὐκ ἐν πειθοῖς σοφ. λόγοις] sc. ἦν, *non versabatur in*, did not move *in the element of persuasive words of wisdom*, such words as are philosophically arranged and thereby fitted to persuade. Πειθός is found nowhere else in the whole range of extant Greek literature, πιθανός being the word in use (Xen. *Cyr.* vi. 4. 5 ; Thuc. iv. 21 ; Dem. 928. 14 ; Josephus, *Antt.* viii. 9 ; and the passages from Plato in Ast, *Lex.* III. p. 102. Meineke, *Menand.* p. 222). Πειθός, however, is formed from πείθω by correct analogy as φειδός from φείδομαι, etc. Comp. Salmasius, *de ling. Hellenist.* p. 86 ; Reiche, *Comment. crit.* I. p. 136 f. It was in all likelihood an adjective belonging only to the colloquial language of common life. Kypke, indeed (*Obs.* II. p. 193), would find some trace of it in Plato, *Gorg.* p. 493 A ; but what we have there is a *play on the words* τὸ πιθανόν and πίθος, *a cask*, which has no connection whatever with πειθός. Pasor and Schrader make πειθοῖς to be the dative plural of πειθώ, *suada*, and what follows to be in apposition to it : *in persuasions, in words of wisdom*. But the plural of πειθώ also has no existence ; and how abrupt such an apposition would be, as well as wholly at variance with the parallel in ver. 13 ! The following are simply *conjectures* (comp. the critical remarks) : Beza and Erasmus Schmid (after Eusebius), ἐν πειθοῖ σοφίας λόγων ; Grotius, ἐν πιστοῖς κ.τ.λ. ; Valckenaer, Klose, and Kühn (*Commentat. ad 1 Cor.* ii. 1–5, Lips. 1784), ἐν πιθανοῖς or πειθανοῖς κ.τ.λ. (comp. also Alberti, *Schediasm.* p. 105) ; Alberti, ἐν πειθοῦς (*suadae*) σ. λόγοις, or ¹ ἐν πειθοῖ σοφίας (without λόγοις). — ἐν ἀποδείξει πνεύματος κ. δυνάμεως] Without there being any necessity for explaining the two genitives by a ἐν διὰ δυοῖν as equivalent to πνεύματος δυνατοῦ (so still Pott, Flatt, Billroth, Olshausen, Maier, with older expositors), the meaning may, according to our interpretation of ἀπόδειξις and to our taking the genitives in an objective or subjective sense, be either : *so that I evinced Spirit and power* (so Vatablus and others, with Pott and Billroth) ; or : *so that Spirit and power made themselves known through me* (Calvin :

¹ So, too, Semler, Flatt, Rinck, Fritzsche in the *Hall. Lit. Zeit.* 1840, Nr. 100.

"in Pauli ministerio quasi nuda Dei manus se proferebat") ; or : *so that Spirit and power gave the proof* (Rückert, de Wette, Osiander, Neander, and Maier, following older commentators). The last is most in keeping with the purposely chosen expression ἀπόδειξις (found here only in the N. T. ; Dem. 326. 4 ; Plato, *Phaed.* p. 77 C, *Theaet.* p. 162 E, and often ; 3 Macc. iv. 20), and with the significant relation to οὐκ ἐν πειθοῖς σ. λόγοις. Paul means *the Holy Spirit* (ver. 10 ff.) and the *divine power* communicating itself therein, ver. 5 (Rom. i. 16 ; 2 Cor. iv. 7 ; 1 Thess. i. 5), which wrought through his preaching upon the minds of men, persuading them of its truth,—the *testimonium Spiritus Sancti internum*.¹ At variance with the text is the view of several of the older expositors (following Origen, *contra Celsum*, i. p. 5), who refer πνεύματος to the oracles of the O. T., and δυνάμ. to the miracles of the apostle ; as well as the view of Grotius, that the former applies to the prophecies, and the latter to the cures, by means of which Paul had given the ἀπόδειξις.

Ver. 5. Aim of the divine leading, the organ of which the apostle knew himself to be, in what is set forth in ver. 4 : *in order that your faith* (in Christ) *may be based*, have its causal ground (comp. Bernhardt, p. 210), *not on man's wisdom, but on God's power* (which has brought conviction to you through my speech and preaching). That ἵνα introduces not *his own* (Hofmann), but the *divine purpose*, is clear from ἐν ἀποδείξει κ.τ.λ., in which Paul has stated how *God* had wrought through him. Comp. ἵνα in i. 31.

Vv. 6–16. *Wisdom, however, we deliver among the perfect ; but it is a higher wisdom revealed to us by the Spirit, which therefore only those filled with the Spirit, and not the sensuous, apprehend.* — Paul having, in i. 17–31, justified the simple and non-philosophical method of proclaiming the gospel from the nature of its contents, and having now, in ii. 1–5, applied this to himself and his own preaching among the Corinthians, there might be attributed to him the view that what the preachers of the gospel set forth was no σοφία at all,—a supposition which, in writing to the Corinthians above all, he could not safely leave uncontradicted. He now shows, accordingly, that among ripened Christians there is certainly a σοφία delivered, but not a philosophy in the common, worldly sense, etc.

Ver. 6. *Wisdom, nevertheless* (unphilosophical as my discourse among you was), *we deliver among the perfect.* — λαλοῦμεν] *we speak it out*, hold it not back. That the *plural* does not refer to Paul alone (so *usually*), but to *the apostolic teachers in general*, is clear from the καὶ ἐγώ in iii. 1, which introduces the particular application of the plural statement here. — ἐν means nothing else than *in, surrounded by, among, coram* ; λαλεῖν ἐν corresponds to the λαλεῖν with the dative in iii. 1. We must therefore reject not only the rendering *for the perfect* (Flatt, with older expositors), which is in itself linguistically untenable (for even in such passages as those cited by Bern-

¹ Theophylact is right in supposing as regards πνεύματος : ἀρρήτω τινὶ τρόπῳ πίστιν ἐνεποιεῖ τοῖς ἀκούουσι. He makes δυνάμεως, however, apply to the miracles, as does Theodoret also, who takes the two ele-

ments together, and explains the clause of the θαυματουργία τοῦ πνεύματος. So, too, in substance, Chrysostom, according to whom it is by πνεύματος that the miracles are made to appear as *true* miracles.

hardy, p. 212, the *local* force of *ἐν* should be retained), but also the explanation : *according to the judgment of the perfect* (Grotius, Tittmann, *de Spir. Dei mysterior. div. interprete*, Lips. 1814, in the *Syn. N. T.* p. 285), which would have to be referred, with Billroth, to the conception of *among*, since the corresponding usage of *ἐν ἐμοί, ἐν σοί*, in the sense, *according to my or thy view*, applies exclusively to these particular phrases (Bernhardy, p. 211). — The *τέλειοι* (comp. on Eph. iv. 13), who stand in contrast to the *νήπιοι ἐν Χριστῷ* are *those who have penetrated beyond the position of beginners in Christian saving knowledge to the higher sphere of thorough and comprehensive insight*. The *σοφία*, which is delivered to these, is the Christian analogue to philosophy in the ordinary sense of the word, the *higher religious wisdom of Christianity*, the presentation of which (xii. 8) is not yet appropriate for the beginners in the faith (iii. 1, 2). The *form* of this instruction was that of spiritual discourse (ver. 13) framed under the influence of the holy *πνεῦμα*, but independent of the teachings of philosophic rhetoric ; and its *matter* was the future relations of the Messianic kingdom (vv. 9, 12) in their connection with the divine counsel of redemption and its fulfilment in Christ, the *μυστήρια τῆς βασιλείας τῶν οὐρανῶν* (Matt. xiii. 11),—that, which no eye hath seen, etc. Comp. Bab. Sanhedr. f. xcix. 1 : “Quod ad mundum futurum : oculus non vidit, O Deus, praeter te.” The definitions now given ¹ respecting the *σοφία Θεοῦ* are the only ones that neither go beyond the text, nor are in the least degree arbitrary, while they comprehend also the doctrine of the *κτίσις* as regards its Messianic final destination, Rom. viii.,—that highest analogue to the philosophy of nature. It may be gathered, however, with certainty from iii. 1, 2, that we are not to think here of any *disciplina arcani*. With the main point in our view as a whole,—namely, that *σοφία* denotes that higher religious wisdom, and *τέλειοι* those already trained in Christian knowledge, grown up, as it were, to manhood,—Erasmus, Castalio, Estius, Bengel, Semler, Stolz, as well as Pott, Usteri, Schrader, Rückert, de Wette, Osiander, Ewald, Neander, Maier, Hofmann, accord. Chrysostom, however, Theophylact, Theodoret, Luther, Calvin, Beza, Grotius, Rosenmüller, and others, in-

¹ Comp. Rückert, who, as respects the matter, is of opinion that it includes the higher views regarding the divine plan of the world in relation to the development of the kingdom of God, and especially to the providential government of the Jewish people ; regarding the import of the divine ordinances and appointments before Christ, for example, of the law in reference to the highest end contemplated—the kingdom of God ; regarding the way and manner in which the death and resurrection of Christ bear upon the salvation of the world ; as well as regarding the changes yet in the womb of the future, and, in particular, the events which are linked with the second coming of the Lord. Similarly, and still more in detail, Estius. According to de Wette, portions of this wisdom are to be found in the Epistle to the *Romans*, in the

discussions on justification, on the contrast between Christ and Adam, and on predestination ; in the Epistles to the *Ephesians* and *Colossians*, in the indications there given as to the divine plan of redemption and the person of Christ ; in *our* Epistle, chap. xv. ; views of the same kind in Heb. vii.-x., comp. iv. 11 ff. Osiander makes this *σοφία* to consist in the deeper dogmatic development of the gospel as regards its historical foundations and its eternal consequences reaching on to the consummation of the kingdom of God. Comp. Ewald, p. 139, according to whom its contents turn upon the gospel as the centre and cardinal point of all divine-human history, and for that very reason touch all the problems both of history as a whole, and of the creation. Hofmann rightly includes also the *final* glory of believers.

cluding Tittmann, Flatt, Billroth, and Olshausen, understand by the *τέλειοι* the *Christians* generally, or the *true Christians*, to whom the apostle's doctrine (*σοφίαν λέγει τὸ κήρυγμα καὶ τὸν τρόπον τῆς σωτηρίας, τὸ διὰ σταυροῦ σωθῆναι, τελείους δὲ τοὺς πεπιστευκότας*, Chrysostom), *appeared as wisdom*, not as folly. (E) “*Ea dicimus quae plena esse sapientiae judicabunt veri ac probi Christiani*,” Grotius. But iii. 2 is decisive against this view ; for there *γάλα* denotes the instruction of beginners as distinguished from the *σοφία* (*βρῶμα*). Comp. the appropriate remarks of Castalio on this passage. — *σοφίαν δὲ οὐ τ. αἰῶν. τ.*] *wisdom, however, which does not belong to this age* (δέ, as in Rom. iii. 22, ix. 30 ; Gal. ii. 2 ; Phil. ii. 8), which is not, like the Jewish and Hellenic philosophy, the product and intellectual property of the pre-Messianic age. Comp. i. 20. *Αἰῶνος τούτου σοφίαν ὀνομάζει τὴν ἐξω, ὡς πρόσκαιρον καὶ τῷ αἰῶνι τούτῳ συγκαταλνομένην*, Theophylact. — *οὐδέ*] also (in particular) not. — *τῶν ἀρχ. τ. αἰῶν. τ.*] These are the *rulers* generally (comp. Acts xiii. 27), *the dominant powers* (*procures*) of the pre-Messianic time among Jews and Gentiles. But to say that Paul's meaning is that he does not teach *politics* (Grotius), is to limit his words in a way foreign to the connection ; he affirms generally that the *σοφία* in question is a wisdom to which holders of temporal power are strangers. Comp. ver. 8. It is a mistake to explain the *ἀρχ. τ. αἰῶν. τ.* as referring either to influential *philosophers and men of learning*¹ or to the *demons*, connecting it with 2 Cor. iv. 4, John xii. 31 (Marcion, Origen, some writers referred to by Chrysostom and Theophylact, also Ambrosiaster, Estius, Bertholdt), both of these interpretations being incompatible with the words, and forbidden by ver. 8 ; or lastly, to the *Jewish archontes* alone (Cameron, Hammond, Vorstius, Lightfoot, Locke, Stolz, Rosenmüller), which is contrary to the general character of the expression, and not required by ver. 8 (see on ver. 8). — *τῶν καταργ.*] *which are done away with, i.e. cease to subsist* (i. 28, xv. 24 ; 2 Thess. ii. 8 ; 2 Tim. i. 10 ; Heb. ii. 14), namely, when Christ returning establishes *His kingdom*. Comp. Rev. xvi.–xix. This reference is implied in the context by the emphatic repetition of *τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου*. The expedient of explaining it into : “*Whose power and influence are broken and brought to nought by the gospel*,” Billroth (comp. Flatt and Rückert), rationalizes the apostle's conception, and does not even accord with history.—The *present* participle, as in i. 18. Comp. 2 Cor. iii. 7.

Ver. 7. *Θεοῦ σοφίαν*] *God's philosophy*, of which *God* is the possessor, who has made it known to those who proclaim it, ver. 10. This *Θεοῦ* is with great emphasis prefixed ; the repetition of *λαλοῦμεν*, too, carries with it a certain solemnity, comp. Rom. viii. 15 ; Phil. iv. 17. — *ἐν μυστηρίῳ*] does not belong to *τὴν ἀποκεκρ.* (with which it was connected expressly as early as Theodoret ; comp. Grotius : “*quae diu in arcano recondita fuit*”) but to *λαλοῦμεν*,² not, however, in the sense : “*secreto et apud pauciores*” (Estius, Cornelius à Lapide), since there is no mention of a *disciplina arcani* (see on

¹ These are not even *included* (in opposition to Chrysostom and others, including Osiander), although the *ἄρχοντες* may have accepted their wisdom, played the part of patrons to them, etc. (Theodoret, Theo-

phylact, and others, including Pott ; comp. Neander : “the intellectual rulers of the ancient world.”)

² Erasmus, Estius, Rückert, Schrader, de Wette, Osiander, Hofmann.

ver. 6), but rather : *by means of a secret*, i.e. *by our delivering what has been secret* (a doctrine hidden from the human understanding, and revealed to us by God, see on Rom. xi. 25). To this is to be referred also the rendering of Rückert and Neander : *as a mystery*. Most interpreters, however, join ἐν μυστηρίῳ with σοφίαν, sc. οὐσαν : God's *secret wisdom* (unknown but for revelation). So also Pott, Heydenreich, Billroth, Tittmann, Usteri, Ewald). But the article, although after the anarthrous σοφίαν not in itself absolutely necessary, would be omitted here at the expense of clearness. Paul would have expressed himself with ambiguity, while he might easily have avoided it by τὴν ἐν μυστηρίῳ. On the other hand, if he joined ἐν μυστ. to λαλοῦμεν, he *could* not, seeing that he wished to prefix λαλ. for the sake of emphasis, write otherwise. — τὴν ἀποκεκρ.] as respects its *nature*, by virtue of which it not only had been hidden from all preceding generations, but remained unknown apart from divine revelation. Comp. vv. 9, 10 ; Rom. xvi. 25. The word, which in itself might be dispensed with, is added in order to introduce the following statement with completeness and solemnity. — ἐν προώρ. ὁ Θεὸς κ.τ.λ.] There is no ground here for supplying (with the *majority* of expositors, including Pott and Heydenreich) ἀποκαλύπτειν, γνωρίσαι, or the like, or (with Olshausen) a dative of the person ; or yet for assuming, as do Billroth and Rückert, that Paul meant by ἡν the *object* of the wisdom, the *salvation* obtained through Christ. For προώρ. has its complete and logically correct reference in εἰς δόξαν ἡμ. (comp. Eph. i. 5), so that the thought is : “ *to which wisdom God has, before the beginning of the ages of this world* (in eternity), given the predestination *that by it we should attain to glory*.” This εἰς δόξ. ἡμ. corresponds significantly to the τῶν καταργ. of ver. 6, and denotes the Messianic glory of the Christians which is to begin with the Parousia (Rom. viii. 17, 29 f. ; 1 Thess. ii. 12). That wisdom of God is destined in the eternal divine plan of salvation not to *become* (Hofmann) this glory, but to *establish* and to *realize* it. This destination it attains in virtue of the faith of the subjects (i. 21) ; but the reference to the *spiritual glorification on earth* is not even to be assumed as *included with* the other (in opposition to de Wette, Osiander, Neander, and many older expositors), as also the correlative τῆς δόξης in ver. 8 applies purely to the *heavenly* glory. Bengel says well : “ olim revelandam, tum cum principes mundi destruentur.” It reveals itself then as the wisdom that *makes blessed*, having *attained* in the δόξα of believers the end designed for it by God before the beginning of the world.

Ver. 8. Ἡν] Parallel with the preceding ἡν, and referring to Θεοῦ σοφίαν (Calvin, Grotius, and most commentators, including Flatt, Rückert, de Wette, Osiander, Hofmann), not to δόξ. ἡμῶν (Tertullian *contra Marc.* v. 6, Camerarius, Pott, Billroth, Maier) ; for the essential point in the whole context is the non-recognition of that *wisdom*.¹ — εἰ γὰρ ἐγνώσαν κ.τ.λ.] *parenthet-*

¹ The simple uniform continuation of the discourse by ἡν has a solemn emphasis here, as in Acts iv. 10, and especially often in the Epistle to the Ephesians. All the less reason is there for taking it, with Hofmann, as equivalent in this verse to ταύτην (Buttmann, *neut.*

Gr. p. 243 [E. T. 282]), and as introducing a new principal sentence. The asyndetic similar co-ordination of several relative clauses is, from Homer onward (see Ameis on the *Odyss.* xxiii. 299, *append.*), a very common usage in the classics also.

ical proof from fact for what has been just asserted ; for the ἀλλά in ver. 9 refers to ἣν οὐδεὶς . . . ἔγνωκεν. The *crucifixion of Christ*, seeing that it was effected by Jewish and heathen rulers together, is here considered as the act of the ἀρχ. τ. αἰῶν. *collectively*. — τὸν Κύριον τῆς δόξης] Christ is the *Lord*, and, inasmuch as His qualitative characteristic condition is that of the divine glory in heaven, from which He came and to which He has returned (John xvii. 5 ; Luke xxiv. 26 ; Phil. iii. 20 f. ; Col. iii. 1–4, *al.*), the *Lord of glory*. Comp. Jas. ii. 1. In a precisely analogous way God is called, in Eph. i. 17, ὁ πατὴρ τῆς δόξης. Comp. Acts vii. 2 ; Ps. xxiv. 7 ; Heb. ix. 5. In all these passages the expression of the adjectival notion by the genitive has rhetorical emphasis. Comp. Hermann, *ad Viger.* p. 887. This designation of Christ, however, is *purposely chosen* by way of antithesis to ἐσταύρωσαν ; for ὁ σταυρὸς ἀδοξίας εἶναι δοκεῖ, Chrysostom. Had the ἀρχόντες known that σοφία Θεοῦ, then they would also have known Christ as what He is, the Κύριος τῆς δόξης, and would have received and honoured instead of shamefully crucifying Him. But what was *to them* wisdom was simply nothing more than selfish worldly prudence and spiritual foolishness ; in accordance with it Annas and Caiaphas, Pilate and Herod, acted. Comp., generally, Luke xxiii. 34 ; Acts iii. 17.

Ver. 9. Ἀλλά] *but*, antithesis to ἣν οὐδεὶς τῶν ἀρχόντων τ. αἰ. τ. ἔγνωκεν.— The *passage of Scripture*, which Paul now adduces, is to be translated : “ *What an eye hath not seen, nor an ear heard, and (what) hath not risen into the heart of a man (namely :) all that God hath prepared for them that love Him.*” In the connection of our passage these words are still dependent upon λαλοῦμεν. Paul, that is to say, instead of affirming something further of the *wisdom itself*, and so continuing with another ἣν (which none of the rulers have known, *but which*), describes now the mysterious *contents* of this wisdom, and expresses himself accordingly in the *neuter* form (by ἃ), to which he was induced in the flow of his discourse by the similar form of the *language of Scripture* which floated before his mind. The construction therefore is not anacoluthic (Rückert hesitatingly ; de Wette and Osiander, both of whom hold that it loses itself in the conception of the mysteries referred to) ; neither is it to be supplemented by γέγονε (Theophylact, Grótius). The connection with ver. 10, adopted by Lachmann (in his ed. min.), and in my first and second editions, and again resorted to by Hofmann : *what no eye has seen, etc., God, on the other hand* (δέ, see on i. 23), *has revealed to us, etc.*, is not sufficiently simple, mars the symmetry of the discourse, and is finally set aside by the consideration that, since the quotation manifestly does not go beyond ἀγαπῶσιν αὐτόν, καθὼς γέγραπται logically would need to stand, not *before*, but *after*, ἃ, because in reality this ἃ, and not the καθὼς γέγραπται, would introduce the object of ἀπεκάλυψε. — καθὼς γέγρ.] Chrysostom and Theophylact are in doubt as to what passage is meant, whether a *lost prophecy* (so Theodoret), or Isa. lii. 15. Origen, again, and other Fathers (Fabricius, *ad Cod. Apocr. N. T.* p. 342 ; *Pseudepigr. N. T.* I. p. 1072 ; Lücke, *Einleit. z. Offenb.* I. p. 235), with whom Schrader and Ewald agree, assume, amidst vehement opposition on the part of Jerome, that the citation is from the *Revelation of Elias*, in which Zacharias of Chrysopolis avers (*Harmonia*

Evang. p. 343) that he himself had actually read the words. Grotius regards them as “*e scriptis Rabbīnorum, qui ea habuerunt ex traditione veterē.*” Most interpreters, however, including Osiander and Hofmann, agree with Jerome (on Isa. lxiv. and *ad Pammach. epist. ci.*) in finding here a free quotation from Isa. lxiv. 4 (some holding that there is, besides, a reference to lii. 15, lxv. 17 ; see especially Surenhusius, *καταλλ.* p. 526 ff., also Riggenbach in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1855, p. 596 f. But the difference in sense—not to be got over by forced and artificial interpretation of the passage in Isaiah (see especially Hofmann)—and the dissimilarity in expression are too great, hardly presenting even faint resemblances ; which is never elsewhere the case with Paul, however freely he may make his quotations. There seems, therefore, to remain no other escape from the difficulty than to give credit to the assertion—however much repugnance may have been shown to it in a dogmatic interest from Jerome downwards—made by Origen and others, that the words were from the *Apocalypsis Eliae*. So, too, Bleek in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1853, p. 330. But since it is only passages from the *canonical* Scriptures that are ever cited by Paul with *καθὼς γέγραπ.*, we must at the same time assume that he *intended* to do so here also, but *by some confusion of memory took the apocryphal saying for a canonical passage possibly from the prophecies*, to which the passages of kindred sound in Isaiah might easily give occasion. (F) Comp. also Weiss, *biblische Theol.* p. 298. — ἃ ὀφθαλμοῖς οὐκ εἶδε κ.τ.λ.] For similar designations in the classics and Rabbins of what cannot be apprehended by the senses or intellect, see Wetstein and Lightfoot, *Horae*, p. 162. Comp. Empedocles in Plutarch, *Mor.* p. 17 E : οὐτ’ ἐπιδερκτὰ τὰδ’ ἀνδράσιν, οὐτ’ ἐπακουστὰ, οὐτε νόῳ περιληπτὰ. With respect to ἀναβ. ἐπὶ καρδ., *לָב עַל הָלֵךְ*, *to rise up to the heart*, that is, become a consciously apprehended object of feeling and thought, so that the thing enters as a conception into the sphere of activity of the inner life, comp. on Acts vii. 23. — ποῖς ἀγαπ. αὐτόν] *i.e.* in the apostle’s view : *for the true Christians*.¹ See on Rom. viii. 28: What God has prepared for them is the salvation of the Messianic kingdom. Comp. Matt. xxv. 34. *Constitt. Apost.* vii. 32. 2 : οἱ δὲ δίκαιοι πορεύονται εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον κληρονομοῦντες ἐκεῖνα, ἃ ὀφθαλμοῖς οὐκ εἶδε κ.τ.λ.

Ver. 10. Having thus set forth the hitherto *hidden* character of the divine σοφία, Paul now turns to its *unveiling*, as a result of which it was that that λαλοῦμεν of ver. 6 f. took place. In doing this he puts ἡμῖν emphatically first in the deep consciousness of the distinction implied in so signal a mark of divine favour. The *object* of ἀπεκάλ. is the immediately preceding ἃ ἡτοίμασεν κ.τ.λ. — ἡμῖν] *plural*, as λαλοῦμεν in ver. 6, and therefore neither to be referred to the apostle alone (Rosenmüller, Rückert, and others), nor to all Christians (Billroth, etc.). — διὰ τοῦ πνεύμ. αὐτοῦ] The Holy Spirit, pro-

¹ Clement, *ad Cor.* I. 34, in quoting this same passage (with his usual formula for scriptural quotations, λέγει γάρ), has here τοῖς ὑπομένουσιν αὐτόν, remembering perhaps Isa. lxiv. 4 in the LXX. Clement also, there can be no doubt, held the passage to

be canonical, which is explained, however, by the fact of his being acquainted with our Epistle. The *Constitt. apost.* too, vii. 32. 2, have τοῖς ἀγαπῶσιν αὐτόν. The so-called second Epistle of Clement, chap. xi., has the passage only as far as ἀνέβη.

ceeding forth from God as the personal principle of Christian enlightenment, of every Christian endowment, and of the Christian life, *is the medium*, in His being communicated to men (ver. 12), of the divine revelation ; He is the *bearer* of it ; Eph. i. 17, iii. 3, 5 ; 1 Cor. xii. 11, xiv. 6, *al.* — τὸ γὰρ πνεῦμα κ.τ.λ.] Herewith begins the *adducing of proof* for that ἡμῖν δὲ ἀπεκάλυψεν κ.τ.λ. which continues on to ver. 12, to this effect, namely : *For the Spirit is familiar with the mysteries of God, because He alone stands in that unique relation as respects knowledge to God, which corresponds to the relation of the human spirit to man* (vv. 10, 11) ; *but what we have received is no other than this Spirit of God, in order that we might know the salvation of God* (ver. 12), so that no doubt remains that we have actually the ἀποκάλυψις in question through the Spirit. That τὸ πνεῦμα means not the *human spirit*, but the *Holy Spirit*, is certain from what goes before and from vv. 11, 12. — ἐρευνᾷ] rightly interpreted by Chrysostom : οὐκ ἀγνοίας, ἀλλ' ἀκριβοῦς γνώσεως ἐνταῦθα τὸ ἐρευνᾶν ἐνδεικτικόν. Comp. Ps. cxxxix. 1 ; Rom. viii. 27 ; Rev. ii. 23. The word expresses the *activity* of this knowledge. But Paul was not thinking of "God's knowing Himself in man" (Billroth, comp. Baur), or of any other such Hegelian views as they would impute to him. — πάντα] *all things*, without limitation. Comp. Wisd. vii. 23 ; Ps. cxxxix. 7. — τὰ βάθη τοῦ Θεοῦ] Comp. Judith viii. 14 : βάθος καρδίας ἀνθρώπου ; see on Rom. xi. 33, also Plato, *Theæt.* p. 183 E. The expression : "*depths of God*," denotes *the whole rich exhaustless fulness* which is hidden in God,—all, therefore, that goes to make up His being, His attributes, His thoughts, plans, decrees, etc. These last (see vv. 9, 12), the βαθύβουλον (Aeschylus, *Pers.* 143) of the Godhead, are *included* ; but we are not to suppose that they *alone* are meant. The opposite is τὰ θατέα τοῦ Σατανᾶ, Rev. ii. 24. The depths of God, unsearchable by the cognitive power of created spirits (comp. Rom. xi. 33), are penetrated by the cognitive activity of His own immanent principle of life and manifestation, so that this, *i.e.* the Holy Spirit, is the power [Potenz] of the divine self-knowledge. God is the subject knowing and the object known in the intrinsic divine activity of the Spirit, who is the substratum of the absolute self-consciousness of the Godhead, in like manner as the human spirit is the substratum of the human *Ego*.

Ver. 11 assigns the reason for the καὶ τὰ βάθη τοῦ Θεοῦ just mentioned, and that in such a way as to represent the searching of these βάθη as *exclusively* pertaining to the Spirit of God, according to the analogy of the relation between the spirit of man and man himself. — ἀνθρώπων] should neither, with Grotius, be held superfluous nor, with Tittmann, be suspected (it is wanting in A, Or. 1, Athan. Cyr. Vigil. taps.) ; on the contrary, it is designed to carry special emphasis, like τοῦ ἀνθρώπου afterwards (which is wanting in F G, and some Fathers), hence also the position chosen for it : ἀνθρώπων τὰ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου : *no man knows what is man's, save the spirit of the man which is in him.*¹ Comp. Prov. xx. 27. Were what is peculiar to him not known

¹ The τὸ ἐν αὐτῷ is an *argumentative* definition.—In the man the subject knowing is the Ego of the personal self-consciousness,

hence τὸ πνεῦμα, not ἡ ψυχὴ. Comp. Delitzsch, *biblische Psychologie*, p. 198 ; Krumm, *de notionib. psychol. Paul.* p. 16 f.

to the spirit itself of the man (who is made the object of contemplation), in that case no man would have this knowledge of the man; it would not come within the region of *human* knowing at all. The man's own spirit knows it, but no other man.—We are not, with many expositors, including Pott and Flatt, to add βάθη by way of supplement to τὰ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου or to τὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ. This would be a purely arbitrary limitation of the universal statement, to which τὰ βάθη, as a qualitative expression, is *subordinated*. What are meant are the *relations* in general of God and of man, more especially, from the context, the *inner* ones. The illustration adduced by Grotius serves to bring out the sense more clearly: “Principum abditos sensus quis novit nisi ipse principis animus?”—ἐγνώκε] *cognita habet*. See Bernhardt, p. 378. For the rest, this οὐδεὶς ἐγνώκε is, as a matter of course, said not as in distinction from the *Son* (Luke x. 22), but from the *creatures*.

REMARK.—The comparison in ver. 11 ought not to be pressed beyond the point compared. We are neither, therefore, to understand it so that the Spirit of God appears as the soul of the divine substance (Hallet; see, on the other hand, Heilmann, *Opusc.* II.), nor as if He were not distinct from God (see, on the contrary, ver. 10), but simply so that the Spirit of God, the ground of the divine personal life, appears in His relation to God as the *principle of the divine self-knowledge*, in the same way as the principle of the human self-knowledge is the πνεῦμα of the man, which constitutes his personal life. Hence God is known only by His Spirit, as the man is only by his spirit, as the vehicle of his own self-consciousness, not by another man. With τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ Θεοῦ, Paul does not again join τὸ ἐν αὐτῷ, because the *man's* spirit indeed is shut up in the man, but not so the Divine Spirit in God; the latter, on the contrary, goes forth also from Him, is communicated, and is τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ. See ver. 12.

Ver. 12. Δέ] leading on to the second half of the demonstration which began with τὸ γὰρ πνεῦμα in ver. 10 (see on ver. 10). — ἡμεῖς] as ἡμῖν in ver. 10. — τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ κόσμου] i.e. *the spirit which unbelieving mankind has*. This spirit is the *diabolic* πνεῦμα, that is, the spirit *proceeding forth from the devil*, under whose power the κόσμος lies, and whose sphere of action it is. See 2 Cor. iv. 4; Eph. vi. 11, 12, ii. 2. Comp. John xii. 31; 1 John iv. 3, v. 19. Had we received *this* spirit,—and here Paul glances back at the ἀρχοντες τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου in vv. 6, 8,—then assuredly the knowledge of the blessings of eternity would have remained closed for us, and (see ver. 13) instead of utterances taught by the Spirit we should use the language of the human wisdom of the schools. It is indeed the πνεῦμα τῆς πλάνης as contrasted with the πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας, 1 John iv. 6. Most commentators take τὸ πνεῦμα in the sense of *mode of thought and view*, so that the meaning would be: “Non sumus instituti sapientia mundana et saeculari,” Estius. So Theophylact, and after him Beza, Calvin, Grotius, and many others, including Morus, Rosenmüller, Flatt, Heydenreich, de Wette, Maier, and similarly Pott.¹ But, according to ver. 10, τὸ πνεῦμα must denote, in keeping

¹ [So also Stanley and Hodge, but Beet and Principal Brown agree with Meyer, whose view is clearly correct.—T. W. C.]

with the context, the *objective* spirit opposed to the Spirit of God ; and that is, according to the decided dualistic view of the apostle (comp. esp. Eph. ii. 2), the *diabolic* πνεῦμα, which has blinded the understanding of the unbelievers, 2 Cor. iv. 4. Billroth's explanation : that it is the *non-absolute* spirit, the finite, in so far as it persists for itself and does not resolve itself into the divine, is a modern un-Pauline importation ; and this holds, too, of Hofmann's exposition : that it is the spirit, in virtue of which the world is conscious of itself, knowing itself, however, only in that way in which alone its sinful estrangement from God leaves it possible for it to do so, not in God, namely, but out of God. If that is not to be taken as the diabolic spirit, then the conception is simply an un-Pauline fabrication, artificially worded so as to explain away the diabolic character. Lastly, Rückert's view, that Paul meant : "we have received our πνεῦμα not from the world, but from God," cannot even be reconciled with the words of the passage. — τὸ ἐκ τ. Θεοῦ] The ἐκ is employed by Paul here not in order to avoid the appearance of making this πνεῦμα the principle that determines the action of God (so Kling in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1839, p. 435), which were a needless precaution, but because this form of expression has a significant adaptation to the ἵνα εἰδῶμεν κ.τ.λ. ; there can be no doubt about this *knowing*, if it proceeds from the Spirit which is *from* God (which has gone forth upon believers ; comp. ver. 11, τὸ ἐν αὐτῷ), John xv. 26. — ἵνα εἰδῶμεν κ.τ.λ.] the divine purpose in imparting the Spirit which proceeded forth from God. This clause, expressive of design, containing the object of the ἀπεκάλυψε in ver. 10, completely winds up the adducing of proof for the ἡμῖν δὲ ἀπεκάλ. ὁ Θ. διὰ τ. πν. αὐτ. — τὰ ὑπὸ τ. Θεοῦ χαρ. ἡμῖν] are the blessings of the Messianic kingdom, the possession of which is bestowed by divine grace on the Christians (ἡμῖν), not, indeed, before the Parousia as an *actual* possession, but as an *ideal* one to be certainly entered upon hereafter (Rom. viii. 24, 30 ; Col. iii. 3, 4) ; comp. Rom. vi. 23 ; Eph. ii. 8, 9. That to take it ideally in this way is correct (in opposition to Hofmann), is clear from the consideration that τὰ χαρισθέντα must be identical with ἃ ἡτοίμασεν ὁ Θεὸς κ.τ.λ. in ver. 9, and with the δόξα ἡμ. in ver. 7.

Ver. 13. Having thus in vv. 10–12 given the proof of that ἡμῖν δὲ ἀπεκάλ. κ.τ.λ., the apostle goes on now to the *manner in which* the things revealed were *proclaimed*, passing, therefore, from the εἰδέναι τὰ χαρ. to the λαλεῖν of them. The manner, negative and positive, of this λαλεῖν (comp. ver. 4) he links to what has gone before simply by the relative : *which* (namely, τὰ . . . χαρισθ. ἡμ.) *we also* (in accordance with the fact of our having received the Spirit, ver. 12) *utter not in words learned of human wisdom* (dialectics, rhetoric, etc.), *but in those learned of the Spirit*. The genitives : ἀνθρωπ. σοφ. and πνεύματος, are dependent on διδακτοῖς (John vi. 45). See Winer, pp. 182, 178 [E. T. 242, 236]. Pflugk, *ad Eur. Hec.* 1135. Comp. Pindar, *Ol.* ix. 153 : πολλοὶ δὲ διδακταῖς ἀνθρώπων ἀρεταῖς κλέος ὄρουσαν ἐλέσθαι· ἀνευ δὲ θεοῦ κ.τ.λ., comp. *Nem.* iii. 71. Sophocles, *El.* 336 : τὰ μὰ νοθετήματα κείνης διδακτά. It is true that the genitives might also be dependent upon λόγοις (Fritzsche, *Diss. II. in 2 Cor.* p. 27) ; but the context, having διδακτοῖς πνεύματος, is against this. To take διδακτοῖς (with Ewald) as meaning, according to the

common classical usage, *learnable, quae doceri possunt* (see especially Demosth. 1413. 24 ; Plato, *Prot.* p. 319 B : οὐ διδακτὸν εἶναι μὴδ' ὑπ' ἀνθρώπων παρασκευαστὸν ἀνθρώποις), does not agree so well with vv. 4 and 15.—The *suggestio verborum*, here asserted, is reduced to its right measure by διδακτοῖς ; for that word excludes all idea of anything mechanical, and implies the living self-appropriation of that mode of expression which was specifically suitable both to the divine inspiration and to its contents (“verba rem sequuntur,” Wetstein),—an appropriation capable of being connected in very different forms with different given individualities (Peter, Paul, Apollos, James, etc.), and of presenting itself in each case with a corresponding variety. — πνευματικοῖς πνευματικὰ συγκρίνοντες] *connecting¹ spiritual things with spiritual*, not *uniting things unlike in nature*, which would be the case, were we to give forth what was revealed by the *Holy Spirit* in the speech of *human wisdom*, in philosophic discourse, but joining to the matters revealed by the Spirit (πνευματικοῖς) the speech also taught by the Spirit (πνευματικά),—things consequently of *like nature*, “spiritualibus spiritualia componentes” (Castalio). So in substance also Erasmus, Beza, Calvin, Balduin, Wolf, Baumgarten, Kling in the *Stud. und Krit.* 1839, p. 437, de Wette, Osiander, Maier, etc., and rightly, since this sense suits the connection singularly well, and does not in any degree clash with the classical use of συγκρίνειν (Valckenaer, p. 134 f. ; Porson, *ad Med.* 136). Plato has it frequently in this meaning, and in contrast to διακρίνειν. See Ast, *Lex. Plat.* III. p. 290 f. Other commentators, while also taking πνευματ. as *neuter*, make συγκρίνειν, *explicare*, namely, either : *explaining the N. T. doctrine from the types of the O. T.* (Chrysostom and his successors²), or : “exponentes ea, quae prophetae Spiritu Dei acti dixere, per ea, quae Christus suo Spiritu nobis aperuit” (Grotius, Krebs), or : “spiritualibus verbis spiritualia interpretantes” (Elsner, Mosheim, Bolten, Neander). But the first two of these renderings are against the context, and all the three are against the *usus loquendi* ; for συγκρίνειν is never absolutely *interpretari*, either in profane Greek (in which, among later writers, as also in 2 Cor. x. 12, Wisd. vii. 29, xv. 18, 1 Macc. x. 71, it very often means to *compare* ; comp. Vulgate : *comparantes*, and see Lobeck, *ad Phryn.* p. 278) or in the LXX. With the latter it is indeed the common word for the *interpretation of dreams* (φῶτα, see Gen. xl. 8, 16, 22, xli. 12, 15 ; Dan. v. 12) ; but in such cases (comp. the passages from Philo, where διακρίνειν occurs, in Loesner, p. 273) we have to trace it back to the literal signification of *judging*,³ namely, as to what was to be indicated by the

¹ Not *proving*, as Theodore of Mopsuestia takes it : διὰ τῶν τοῦ πνεύματος ἀποδείξεων τὴν τοῦ πνεύματος διδασκαλίαν πιστούμεθα.

² So, too, Theodoret : ἔχομεν γὰρ τῆς παλαιᾶς διαθήκης τὴν μαρτυρίαν, καὶ δι' ἐκείνης τὴν καινὴν βεβαιούμεν· πνευματικὴ γὰρ καὶ ἐκείνη . . . καὶ διὰ τῶν τύπων δείκνυμεν τὴν ἀλήθειαν. Several of the older interpreters follow the Greeks in substance, including Calovius, who, on the ground of this passage, declares himself against the explanation of Scripture from profane writers !

³ Hence, in Dan. v. 16 (in the history of the mysterious writing on the wall, which had to be judged of with respect to its meaning) : δύνασαι κρίματα συγκρίναι, thou canst *pronounce utterances of judgment*. Comp. the phrase, recurring more than once in that same story of Belshazzar, in Dan. v. : τὴν σύγκρισιν γνωρίζειν, or : ἀναγγέλλειν : to make known or declare the judgment (as to what that marvellous writing might signify).

vision in the dream (comp. κρίνειν τὸ σημαίνόμενον τῶν ὀνειράτων in Josephus, *Antt.* ii. 2. 2, also the ὀνειροκριτικά of Artemidorus). (G) The meaning, *to judge*, however, although instances of it may be established in Greek writers also (*Anthol.* vii. 132; Polybius, xiv. 3. 7, xii. 10. 1; Lucian. *Soloec.* 5), would be unsuitable here, for this reason, that the phrase πνευματικοῖς πνευματικά, both being taken as neuter, manifestly, according to the context, expresses the relation of matter and form, not the judging of the one πνευματικόν by the other (Ewald), notwithstanding that Luther, too, adopts a similar interpretation: “*and judge spiritual things spiritually.*” Lastly, it is incorrect to take πνευματικοῖς as masculine, and render: *explaining things revealed by the Spirit to those who are led by the Spirit* (the same as τελείοις in ver. 6; comp. Gal. vi. 1).¹ To the same class belongs the exposition of Hofmann, according to whom what is meant is the *solution of the problem* as to how *the world beyond and hereafter* reveals and foreshows itself in what God’s grace *has already bestowed* upon us (ver. 12) in a predictive sign as it were,—a solution which has spiritual things for its object, and takes place for those who are spiritual. But the text does not contain either a contrast between the world here and that hereafter, or a problematic relation of the one to the other; the contrast is introduced into τὰ χαρισθέντα in ver. 12, and the problem and its predictive sign are imported into συγκρίνοντες.² Again, it is by no means required by the connection with ver. 14 ff. that we should take πνευματικοῖς as masculine; for ver. 14 begins a new part of the discourse, so that ψυχικὸς ἄνθρωπος only finds its personal contrast in ὁ δὲ πνευματικὸς in ver. 15. Tittmann’s explanation (*Synon.* p. 290 f., and comp. Baur) comes back to the sense: *conveying (conferentes)* spiritual things to spiritual persons, without linguistic precedent for it. — Note the weighty collocation: πνεύματος, πνευματικοῖς, πνευματικά.

Ver. 14. To receive such teaching, however, in which πνευματικά are united with πνευματικοῖς, every one has not the capacity; a psychical man apprehends not that which is the Spirit of God, etc. — ψυχικὸς ἄνθρωπος is the opposite of the πνευματικὸς who has received the Holy Spirit (vv. 12 f., 15); he is therefore one πνεῦμα (the Holy Spirit) μὴ ἔχων (Jude 19). Such a man—who is not essentially different from the σαρκικός (see on iii. 1), but the mental side of whose nature is here brought forward by the word ψυχικός—is not enlightened and sanctified by the Spirit of God, but is governed by the ψυχή, the principle of life for the σάρξ, so that the sphere in which he works and strives is not that of the divine truth and the divine ζωή, but the purely human activity of the understanding, and, as regards practical things, the interests of the life of sense, the ἐπιθυμίαι ψυχικάί, 4 Macc. i. 32, the ἐπιθυμίαι ἀνθρώπων, not the θέλημα Θεοῦ, 1 Pet. iv. 2. Comp. generally, Weiss, *biblische Theol.* p. 270 f. The higher principle of life, the

¹ This is the view of Pelagius, Sedulius, Theophylact (suggested only), Thomas, Estius, Clericus, Bengel, Rosenmüller, Pott, Heydenreich, Flatt, Billroth, Rückert.

² Hofmann expounds as if Paul had written in ver. 12 f.: τὰ ἡδη νῦν ὑπὸ τ. Θ.

χαρισθέντα ἡμῖν, σημεία ὄντα τῶν μελλόντων, ἀ καὶ συγκρίνομεν . . . πνευματικοῖς πνευματικὰ λαλοῦντες. Comp. on the latter expression, Maximus Tyrius, xxii. 4: συνετὰ συνετοῖς λέγων.

human πνεῦμα,¹ which he has, is not laid hold of and quickened by the Holy Spirit ; the regeneration by the Holy Spirit, who operates upon the human spirit and thereby brings about the renewal of the man (comp. John iii. 6), has not yet taken place with him ; hence the *psychical* man is really the *natural* man, *i.e.* not yet enlightened and sanctified by the Spirit of God, not yet born again,² although, at the same time, ψυχικός means not *naturalis* (*i.e.* φυσικός in contrast to διδακτός, τεχνικός, and the like ; comp. Polyb. vi. 4. 7 : φυσικῶς καὶ ἀκατασκεύως), but *animalis* (Vulgate). Comp. ψυχικὴ σοφία as contrasted with that ἄνωθεν κατερχομένη, Jas. iii. 15. Many have taken up the idea in a one-sided way, either in a merely *intellectual* reference (τὸν μόνον τοῖς οἰκείοις ἀρκούμενον λογισμοῖς, Theodoret ; see also Chrysostom, Theophylact, Beza, Grotius, Heydenreich, Pott ; comp. too, Wieseler on Gal. p. 451), or in a merely *ethical* one (a man obedient to sensual desires ; so, and in some cases, with an exaggerated stress on the sinfulness involved, it is interpreted by Erasmus, Vitranga, Limborch, Clericus, Rosenmüller, Valckenaer, Krause, and others). The two elements cannot be separated from each other without quite an arbitrary act of division. — οὐ δέχεται] The question whether this means : *he is unsusceptible of it, does not understand* (Vulgate, Castalio, Beza, Piscator, Grotius, Rückert, *et al.*) ; or : *he does not accept, respuits* (Peshito, Erasmus, and others, including Tittmann, Flatt, Billroth, de Wette, Osiander, Ewald, Maier), is decided in favour of the *latter*

¹ The distinction between ψυχή and πνεῦμα, as that which separates from each other the agencies of the lower and the higher life, answers certainly to the Platonic threefold division of man's nature into body, soul, and spirit (see, especially, Olshausen, *de naturae humanae trichotomia N. T. scriptoribus recepta*, in his *Opusc.* Berol. 1834, p. 143 ff. ; and, on the other side, Hahn, *Theol. d. N. T.* I. p. 391 ff.). Not, however, as if Paul had borrowed this trichotomy (see, especially, 1 Thess. v. 23 ; comp. also Heb. iv. 12) from the Platonic philosophy, but this Platonic type of anthropology, current also with Philo and the Rabbinical writers, had, like the phrase ὁ ἔσω and ὁ ἔξω ἄνθρωπος (see on Eph. iii. 16), become *popular* (comp. Josephus, *Antt.* i. 1. 2, according to which God breathed πνεῦμα and ψυχὴν into man when first formed, and subsisted *alongside* of the twofold conception and the corresponding mode of expression (v. 3 f., vii. 34 ; 2 Cor. vii. 1 ; Rom. viii. 10 f., *al.*). Comp. Lünemann on 1 Thess. v. 23. Luther, as early as 1521, has some excellent remarks on the trichotomy (printed also in Delitzsch's *bibl. Psychol.* p. 392 f.). He likens the πνεῦμα to the *Sanctum sanctorum*, the ψυχὴ to the *Sanctum*, and the σῶμα to the *Atrium*. Against Hofmann's arbitrary explaining away of a real threefold division (in his *Schriftbeweis*, I. p. 297 f.), see Krumm, *de notionibus psychol. Pauli*, p. 1 ff. ; De-

litzsch, *loc. cit.* p. 87 ff. ; Ernesti, *Ursprung d. Sünde*, II. p. 76 f. We may add, that Hofmann is wrong in saying, with respect to this passage, that it has nothing whatever to do with the question about the dichotomy or trichotomy. It has to do with it, inasmuch as in virtue of the contrast between ψυχικός and πνευματικός, the ψυχὴ cannot be the seat and sphere of operation of the Divine Spirit, which is to be found rather in the human πνεῦμα, and consequently must be conceived as specifically *distinct* from the latter.

² Luther's gloss is : "The *natural* man is as he is *apart from grace*, albeit decked out as bravely as may be with all the reason, skill, sense, and faculty in the world." Comp. Calovius, who insists with justice against Grotius, that ψυχικός and σαρκικός differ only "*ratione formalis significationis*." Paul might have used σαρκικός here too (see on iii. 1) ; but ψυχικός naturally suggested itself to him as correlative to δέχεσθαι ; for the ψυχὴ cannot be the *receptaculum* of that which is of the Spirit of God. According to Ewald, the word points to the Greek *philosophers*, being a *gentle* way of designating them. But the expression is quite general ; and how easy it would have been for Paul to let it be definitely known that the reference was to the philosophers (by σοφός τοῦ κόσμου, for example, or in some other way) !

view by the standing use of *δέχεσθαι* in the N. T. when referring to doctrine. See Luke viii. 13 ; Acts viii. 14, xi. 1, xvii. 11 ; 1 Thess. i. 6, ii. 13. Comp. 2 Thess. ii. 10 ; 2 Cor. viii. 17. — τὰ τοῦ πν.] *what comes from the Spirit*. This applies both to the matter and form of the teaching. See ver. 13. — *μωρία γὰρ . . . γινῶναι*] *ground of this οὐ δέχεται κ.τ.λ. : It is folly to him, i.e. (as i. 18) it stands to him in the practical relation of being something absurd, and he is not in a position to discern it*. The latter clause is not covered by the former (Hofmann), but appends to the relation of the object to the subject the corresponding relation of the subject to the object.— The statement of the *reason* for both of these connected clauses is : *ὅτι πνευματικῶς ἀνακρίνεται : because they (τὰ τοῦ πνεύμ.) are judged of after a spiritual fashion* (iv. 3, xiv. 24), *i.e. because the investigative (ἀνα) judgment of them (the searching into and estimating their nature and meaning) is a task which, by reason of the nature of the subject-matter to be dealt with, can be performed in accordance with its own essential character in no other way than by means of a proving and judging empowered and guided by the Holy Spirit* (a power which is wanting to the *ψυχικός*). Πνευματικῶς, that is to say, refers not to the *human* spirit, but to the *Holy Spirit* (see ver. 13) who fills the human spirit, and by the hallowing influence of divine enlightenment and power capacitates it for the *ἀνακρίνειν* of the doctrines of teachers filled with the Spirit who address it, so that this *ἀνακρίνειν* is an activity which proceeds *in a mode empowered and guided by the Spirit*. We may add that *ἀνακρίν.* does not mean : *must be judged of* (Luther and many others, among whom are Tittmann, Flatt, and Pott), but it expresses the characteristic relation, *which takes place ; they are subject to spiritual judgment*. That is an *axiom*. But *this very sort of ἀνάκρισις* is what is lacking in the *ψυχικός*.

Ver. 15. *He who is spiritual, on the other hand, judges all things, but is for his own part (αὐτός) judged by no one ; so lofty is his position, high above all the ψυχικοῖς, to whom he is a riddle, not to be read by their unenlightened powers of judging, to which τὰ τοῦ πνεύματος are folly ! — ὁ πνευματικός*] he who stands under the influence of the Holy Spirit, enlightened and led by Him. Comp. on *πνευματικῶς* in ver. 14. — τὰ πάντα] (see the critical remarks)¹ receives from the context no further limitation than that of the article, which is not *unsuitable* (Hofmann), but denotes the *totality of what presents itself to his judging*, so that it does not apply merely to τὰ τοῦ πνεύματος (Ewald : “all the deepest and most salutary divine truths”), the *ἀνακρίνειν* of which, on the part of the *πνευματικός*, is a matter of course, but means *all*

¹ In connection with the reading πάντα, those who take it as *masculine* explain the clause very variously ; *either* : “Quando audit alium loquentem vel docentem, illico dignoscere potest et dijudicare, utrum sit ex Deo necne” (Bos, Alberti) ; *or* : “Ego quidem . . . quemlibet profanum . . . dijudicare adeoque a πνευματικοῖς s. vere collustratis dignoscere possum” (Pott) ; *or* : “Convincere quemlibet profanum erroris potest” (Nösselt, Rosenmüller). Were the reading genuine, and πάντα masculine, it is

only the first of these renderings that would be admissible ; for, according to ver. 14, ἀνακρ. cannot mean *erroris convincere* (against Nösselt), and to restrict πάντα to the profane would be entirely unwarranted by the context, as is plain from πνευματικῶς ἀνακρίνεται in ver. 14 (against Nösselt and Pott). At the same time, it would also be arbitrary in adopting the first view to refer it only to the *loqui* or *docere*, and not also to deeds and other expressions of the life.

objects that come within the sphere of his judgment. To everything that comes before him he can assign the right estimate in virtue of his power of judgment, enlightened and upheld by the Holy Spirit. He has the true critical eye of the δοκιμάζειν (1 Thess. v. 21) for all that offers itself to him to be judged. How often has Paul himself displayed this ἀνάκρισις πνευματική, and that, too, in matters not connected with doctrine, under situations the most varied ! *e.g.* in his wise availing himself of circumstances when persecuted and put on trial, during his last voyage, etc.; in his decisions concerning matrimonial questions, contentings at law, slavery, collections, and the like, in regard to which he manages with consummate tact, and with the most wonderful clearness, precision, and impartiality, to subject everything to the standard of a higher spiritual point of view ; in his estimate of the different persons with whom he comes into contact ; in the mode in which he adapts himself to given relations ; in his sublime judgments, such as iii. 22 ; in his powerful self-witness, 2 Cor. vi. 4 ff. ; in his noble independence from earthly things, 1 Cor. vii. 29 ff. ; Phil. iv. 11 ff.¹—ὕπ' οὐδενός] namely, who is not also πνευματικός. This follows necessarily from the foregoing ὁ πνευματ. ἀνακρίνει τὰ πάντα. Comp. too, 1 John iv. 1. The standpoint of the psychical man is too low, and his mode of thought too foreign in its presuppositions and principles, for him to be able to understand and judge of the pneumatic. In like manner, the blind (see as early as Chrysostom and Theophylact) cannot judge of the painter, nor the deaf of the musician.—How Roman Catholic writers have sought to render ver. 15, standing opposed as it does to the authority claimed by the church, serviceable to their own side, may be seen, *e.g.*, in Cornelius à Lapide : “ Sin autem nova oriatur quaestio in fide aut moribus, eaque obscura et dubia, eadem prudentia dictat homini spirituali . . . ejusdem Spiritus judicio recurrendum esse ad superiores, ad doctores, ad ecclesiam Romanam quasi matricem,” etc.

Ver. 16. Proof for the αὐτὸς δὲ ὑπ' οὐδενὸς ἀνακρίνεται. “*For in order to judge of the πνευματικός, one would need to have known the mind of Christ, which we πνευματικοί are in possession of—to be able to act the part of teacher to Christ.*” The form of this proof is an imperfect syllogism, the last proposition in which, as being self-evident, is not expressed.² The major proposition is clothed in the words of Isa. xl. 13 (substantially after the LXX.), comp. Rom. xi. 34. There, indeed, Κύριος applies to God ; but Paul, appropriating the words freely for the expression of his own thought, applies it here to *Christ* (against Calvin, Grotius, and most older interpreters, also Flatt, Osiander, Ewald, Hofmann), as the minor proposition ἡμεῖς δὲ κ.τ.λ. proves.—The νοῦς Κυρίου is the *understanding* of the Lord, embracing His thoughts, judgments, measures, plans, etc., the νοῦς being the faculty where these

¹ [Surely here the author goes beyond the scope of the passage, which is limited to the things of the Spirit. So Hodge and Poor.—T. W. C.]

² Fully expressed, it would run thus : *No one can know the mind of Christ so as to in-*

struct Him : but we, we πνευματικοί, are they who have the mind of Christ ; therefore we are they also whom no one can know so as to instruct them, that is, just they who ὑπ' οὐδενὸς ἀνακρίνονται, ver. 15.

originate and are elaborated. The conception is not identical with that of the πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ (against Billroth, Neander, and many others), which rather, when imparted to man, *makes* his νοῦς the νοῦς Χριστοῦ, not being *itself* the νοῦς Χ., but that which constitutes its *substratum*. — ὃς συμβιβ. αὐτόν] *qui instructurus sit eum*, i.e. *in order* (after thus coming to know him) *to instruct Him*. See on this use of ὃς, Matthiae, II. p. 1068 ; Kühner, II. p. 529 ff. Regarding συμβιβάζειν, which is frequent in the LXX. in the sense of *instruere*, *docere*, but does not occur with that meaning in Greek writers, see Schleusner, *Thes.* V. p. 154. This ὃς συμβ. αὐτόν is not “*rather superfluously*” taken in along with the rest of the quotation (Rückert), but is included as essential to the proof of the ὑπ’ οὐδενὸς ἀνακρίνεται, since the *forming a judgment* assumes the capacity to *instruct* (act as *master*). This, then, is what he who would judge the πνευματικοί must be capable of doing with respect to *Christ*, since these have the mind of *Christ*. Chrysostom says well : ὃς συμβιβάζει αὐτόν, οὐχ ἀπλῶς προσέθηκεν, ἀλλὰ πρὸς ὃ εἶπεν ἡδη, ὅτι τὸν πνευματικὸν οὐδεὶς ἀνακρίνει· εἰ γὰρ εἰδέναι οὐδεὶς δύναται τοῦ Θεοῦ (rather *Christ’s*) τὸν νοῦν, πολλῶ μᾶλλον διδάσκειν καὶ διορθοῦσθαι.—To refer αὐτόν, with Nösselt (*Opusc.* II. p. 137 f.), to the πνευματικός (so, too, Rosenmüller and Tittmann, *l.c.* p. 294), is an involved construction rendered necessary only by failure to catch the simple course of proof. — ἡμεῖς δὲ νοῦν Χ. ἔχ.] the *minor proposition*, with the emphasis on ἡμεῖς, and the explanatory Χριστοῦ in place of Κυρίου. Paul includes himself along with the rest among the πνευματικοί. These are the *possessors* (ἔχομεν) of the mind of Christ. For, since they have the *Spirit* of Christ (Rom. viii. 9, 16), and since Christ is in them (Rom. viii. 10 ; 2 Cor. xiii. 5), their νοῦς, too, can be no mental faculty different in kind from the νοῦς Χριστοῦ, but must, on the contrary, be as ideally one with it, as it is true that Christ Himself lives in them (Gal. ii. 20), and the heart of Christ beats in them (Phil. i. 8), and He speaks in them (2 Cor. xiii. 3). Comp. respecting this indwelling of Christ in His believers, the idea in Gal. iii. 27 ; Rom. xiii. 14. Οὐ γὰρ Πλάτωνος, οὐδὲ Πυθαγόρου, says Chrysostom, ἀλλ’ ὁ Χριστὸς τὰ ἑαυτοῦ τῇ ἡμετέρᾳ ἐνέθηκε διανοία. Many commentators (not recognizing the process of proof) have interpreted ἔχομεν as *perspectam habemus* (see Tittmann, *l.c.*), as *e.g.* Rosenmüller and Flatt : “We know the meaning of the doctrine of Christ ;” or Grotius : “Novimus Dei consilia, quae Christo fuere revelata.”

NOTES BY AMERICAN EDITOR.

(E) *The “perfect.”* Ver. 6.

Seeing interpreters are so nearly equally divided between the two views which may be taken of this text, it may be well to consider the argument for the opinion which makes “perfect” simply another name for believers. It is thus presented by Dr. Hodge : “1. Those who regarded Paul’s doctrine as foolishness were not the babes in Christ, but the unrenewed, ‘the wise of this world ;’ consequently those to whom it was wisdom were not advanced Christians, but believers as such. Throughout the whole context, the opposition is between ‘the called’ or converted and the unconverted, and not between one

class of believers and another class. 2. If 'the perfect' here means advanced Christians as distinguished from babes in Christ, then the wisdom which Paul preached was not the gospel as such, but its higher doctrines. But this cannot be, because it is the doctrine of the cross, of Christ crucified, which he declares to be the power of God and the wisdom of God. And the description given in the following part of this chapter of the wisdom here intended refers not to the higher doctrines of the gospel, but to the gospel itself. The contrast is between the wisdom of the world and the wisdom of God, and not between the rudimental and the higher doctrines of the gospel. Besides, what are these higher doctrines which Paul preached only to the élite of the church? No one knows. Some say one thing, and some another. But there are no higher doctrines than those taught in this Epistle, and in those to the Romans and Ephesians, all addressed to the mass of the people. The New Testament makes no distinction between (πίστις and γνῶσις) higher and lower doctrines. It does indeed speak of a distinction between milk and strong meat, but that is a distinction, not between kinds of doctrine, but between one mode of instruction and another. In catechisms designed for children the church pours out all the treasures of her knowledge, but in the form of milk, *i.e.* in a form adapted to the weakest capacities. For all these reasons we conclude that by 'the perfect' the Apostle means the competent, the people of God as distinguished from the men of the world; and by wisdom, not any higher doctrines, but the simple gospel, which is the wisdom of God as distinguished from the wisdom of men."

(F) *No confusion of memory.* Ver. 9.

It is impossible to accept the author's hypothesis of a failure or "confusion of memory" in the Apostle. If inspiration has any meaning at all, it must be supposed sufficient to guard its subjects from such imperfections. Nor is the hypothesis at all necessary, although it is adopted by Weiss (Bib. Theol. I. 383). It is quite easy to suppose that the Apostle used scriptural language without intending to give the sense of the original. This is a very common habit among all believers, and that Paul shared in it is evident from Romans x. 18, where he undeniably takes the words of the nineteenth Psalm simply to express the wide diffusion of the gospel, without any reference to their purport as originally given. Of course in this view we must suppose the phrase *As it is written* not to be a form of quotation, but rather equivalent to our purpose when we say, "To use the language of Scripture." Or, if this solution be not acceptable, there is another to fall back upon, viz., that which regards the Apostle as not intending to quote any one passage of Holy Writ, but rather appealing to its authority in general to confirm his position that God surpasses His people's expectations, that He does for them things unheard of before, such indeed as could be known only by revelation. That these things are abundantly taught in the Old Testament requires no argument.

(C) *συγκρίνοντες.* Ver. 13.

The author's objection to the view which renders this important and much-contested word as *explaining* does not seem to be valid. In all the places in which the verb in the active voice occurs in the LXX. it means, with a single exception, to *interpret* or *explain*. (It never occurs in the sense of *con-*

nect.) And the fact that it is applied to the interpretation of dreams presents no difficulty, for in any case the Apostle would have become familiar with its use in this sense. The sense too is every way appropriate, "explaining spiritual things in spiritual words" (substantially what Meyer gives, although he reaches it in a different way), and forms a suitable pendant to what precedes. The Apostle had spoken sufficiently of the *things* of the spirit : here he touches upon the suitable *words* for conveying them. The passage is one of great importance, as showing the value of a biblical phraseology. The wording of Holy Writ is not accidental or capricious, but divinely ordered, and it is in all cases to be adhered to. A needless change of expression not infrequently makes the life and efficacy of the things to vanish. Nor is it a valid objection to this view that it makes inspiration mechanical, for, as Dr. Hodge well asks, "If God can control the thoughts of a man without making him a machine, why cannot he control his language? Why may he not render each writer, polished or rude, infallible in the use of his characteristic style?" That He does exercise such control assures us that in Scripture we have not only divine truth, but that truth communicated in a form free from the discoloring and distorting influence of human imperfection.

CHAPTER III.

Ver. 1. καὶ ἐγώ] A B C D E F G $\aleph$, min. Clem. Or. Chrys. Damasc. read καὶ γώ, which Griesb. Lachm. Scholz, Rückert, Tisch. have adopted, and justly, considering the decisive testimony in its favour. — σαρκικοῖς] Griesb. Lachm. Rückert, Tisch. read σαρκίνους with A B C* D* $\aleph$, 67** 71, Clem. Or. Nyss. To be preferred on like grounds as in Rom. vii. 14. Here the interchange was especially aided by ver. 3, where, according to the preponderance of evidence, σαρκικ. is the true reading; for the fact that D* F G, Or. Nyss. have σάρκιν in ver. 3 also, is simply to be set down as the result of mechanical repetition from ver. 1, the difference in the sense not being recognized.¹ — Ver. 2. οὐδέ] Elz. has οὔτε, in opposition to all the uncials and most Fathers. The former is necessary here (Fritzsche, *ad Marc.* p. 157), but had οὔτε very often substituted for it by the transcribers. — ἔτι] is wanting in B; bracketed by Lachm. But how easily it might fall aside after οὐδέ through similarity in sound, or on the ground that it might be dispensed with when νῦν followed! — Ver. 3. καὶ διχοστασίαι] omitted in A B C $\aleph$, some min. and several vss. and Fathers. Deleted by Lachm. Rückert, and Tisch. Were it genuine, why should it have been left out? An addition by way of gloss (even in texts used by Irenaeus and Cyprian) from Gal. v. 20. — Ver. 4. ἄνθρωποι] adopted also by Lachm. Rückert, and Tisch., followed by Ewald, according to almost all the uncials and several vss. and Fathers. The *Recepta* σαρκικοί, although still defended by Fritzsche and Reiche, is so decidedly condemned by the critical evidence (among the uncials they have only L and $\aleph$ **), that it must be regarded as derived from ver. 3. Οὐχί, too, has flowed from the same source, instead of which, οὐκ is to be restored, with Lachm. Rückert, and Tisch., in accordance with A B C $\aleph$ *, 17, Dam. — Ver. 5. τίς] Lachm. and Rückert read τί, with A B $\aleph$, min. Vulg. It. Aeth. and Latin Fathers. The personal names very naturally suggested the masculine to transcribers.—The order Παῦλος . . . Ἀπολλῶς (in Elz. and Scholz) arose from ver. 4; compare i. 12.—Before διάκονοι, Elz. and Tisch. have ἀλλ' ἧ, which, however, from the decisive weight of testimony against it, must be regarded as an addition to denote the sense: *nil nisi*. — Ver. 12. τοῦτον] is

¹ Fritzsche, indeed (*ad Rom.* II. p. 46, and *de conform. N. T. Lachm.* p. 49), holds that the form σάρκινος in this passage, Rom. vii. 14, and Heb. vii. 16, is an offspring of the transcribers. But it was precisely the other form σαρκικός, so well known and familiar to them, which thrust itself upon the copyists for involuntary or even deliberate adoption. Reiche, in his *Comment. crit.* I. p. 138, has made the most elaborate defence of the *Recepta*, and attempted to weaken the force of the evidence on the other side. See the same author, too, on Heb. vii. 16. The most decisive argument from the exter-

nal evidence against the *Recepta* is, that precisely the weightiest Codices A B C $\aleph$, are equally unanimous in reading σάρκινος in ver. 1. and σαρκικοί in ver. 3; and we cannot at all see why the hand of an emendator should have inserted the more classical word only in ver. 1, while leaving the unclassical σαρκικοί in ver. 3. Besides, we have σαρκίναίς in 2 Cor. iii. 3, entirely *without* any various reading σαρκικαῖς, from which we may conclude that the distinction in meaning between the two words was well known to the transcribers.

wanting in A B C* 8*, Sahid. Ambr. Deleted by Lachm. and Rückert. The omission, however, was easily occasioned by *Homoioteleuton*, and was aided by the fact that the word could be dispensed with. — Ver. 13. τὸ πῦρ] Lachm. Rückert, and Tisch. read τὸ πῦρ αὐτό, with A B C, min. Sahid. and several Fathers. Rightly; the αὐτό not being in any way essential was easily disregarded. — Ver. 17. τοῦτον] Lachm. and Rückert have αὐτόν, which Griesb. too recommended, with A D E F G, min. Syr. Arr. Aeth. Arm. Syr. p. (on the margin) Vulg. and It. (*illum*), and Latin Fathers. But, after εἰ τις in the protasis, αὐτόν offered itself in the apodosis as the more common. — Ver. 22. ἐστίν] has preponderant evidence against it. Suspected by Griesb., deleted by Lachm. Rückert, and Tisch. A repetition from ver. 21.

Vv. 1–4. *Application of the foregoing section (ii. 6–16) to the Apostle's relation to the Corinthians.*

Ver. 1. Καγώ] *I also*. This *also* of comparison has its inner ground in the reproach alluded to, that he ought to have taught in a higher strain, and so ought to have delivered to the Corinthians that Θεοῦ σοφίαν spoken of in ver. 6 f. *Even as no other could have done this, so I also could not*. There is no reason, therefore, for holding, with de Wette (comp. Billroth), that καὶ ὑμῖν would have been a more stringent way of putting it. — ἀλλ' ὡς σαρκίνοις] namely, *had I to speak to you*. See Kühner, II. p. 604. Krüger on Thuc. i. 142. 4, and on Xen. *Anab.* vii. 2. 28. This brevity of expression is zeugmatic. Σάρκινος (see the critical remarks) is : *fleshy* (2 Cor. iii. 3), not equivalent to σαρκικός, *fleshly*. See on Rom. vii. 14. Winer, p. 93 [E. T. 122], and Fritzsche, *ad Rom.* II. p. 46. Here, as in Rom. *l.c.* and Heb. vii. 16 (see Delitzsch *in loc.*), the expression is *specially chosen* in order to denote *more strongly* the unspiritual nature : *as to fleshy persons*, as to those who have as yet experienced so little of the influence of the Holy Spirit, that the σάρξ—*i.e.* the nature of the natural man, which is opposed since the fall to the Spirit of God, and which, as the seat of the sin-principle and of lust, gives rise to the incapacity to recognize the sway of the Divine Spirit (comp. ii. 14) and to follow the drawing of the νοῦς towards the divine will (Rom. vii. 18, 25), by virtue of the Divine Spirit (see on Rom. iv. 1, vi. 19, vii. 14, viii. 5 ff.)—seemed to make up their whole being. They were still in too great a measure only “flesh born of the flesh” (John iii. 6), and still lay too much, especially in an intellectual relation, under the ἀσθενεία τῆς σαρκός (Rom. vi. 19), although they might also be in part φνσιούμενοι ὑπὸ τοῦ νοῦς τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτῶν (Col. ii. 18),—so that Paul, in order *strongly* to express their condition at that time, could call them *fleshy*. By σάρκινος, therefore, he indicates the *unspiritual* nature of the Corinthians,—*i.e.* a nature ruled by the limitations and impulses of the σάρξ, not yet changed by the Holy Spirit,—the nature which they still had when *at the stage of their first novitiate in the Christian life*. At a later date (see ver. 3) they appear as still at least σαρκικοί (guiding themselves according to the σάρξ, and disobedient to the πνεῦμα); for although, in connection with continued Christian instruction, they had become more effectually partakers also of the influence of the Divine Spirit, nevertheless,—as their sectarian

tendencies (see ver. 3) gave proof,—they had not so followed this divine principle as to prevent the sensuous nature opposed to it (the *σάρξ*) from getting the upper hand with them in a moral and intellectual respect, so that they were consequently still *κατὰ σάρκα* and *ἐν σαρκί* (Rom. viii. 5, 8), *τὰ τῆς σαρκὸς φρονοῦντες* (Rom. viii. 5), *κατὰ σάρκα καυχώμενοι* (2 Cor. xi. 18), *ἐν σοφίᾳ σαρκικῇ* (2 Cor. i. 12), etc. It is therefore with true and delicate acumen that Paul uses in ver. 1 and ver. 3 these two different expressions each in its proper place, *upbraiding* his readers, not indeed by the former, but certainly by the latter, with their unspiritual condition.¹ The ethical notions conveyed by the two terms are not the *same*, but of the same *kind*; hence *ἔτι* in ver. 3 is logically correct (against the objection of de Wette and Reiche).

The *difference* between *σάρκικός* (also *σάρκινος*) and *ψυχικός* is simply this: *ψυχικός* is one who has not the Holy Spirit, and stands wholly outside of the sphere of His influence; whether it be that he has never yet received Him and is therefore still in the natural state without Christ (*homo naturalis*, as in ii. 14), or that he has been forsaken again by the Spirit (as in Jude 19). *Σαρκικός*, on the other hand, may be affirmed not merely of the *ψυχικός*, who is indeed *necessarily* *σαρκικός*, but also (comp. Hofmann) of one who has, it is true, received the Holy Spirit and experiences His influence, but is not led by His enlightening and sanctifying efficacy in such a measure as to have overcome the power of sin (Gal. v. 17) which dwells in the *σάρξ* and sets itself against the Spirit; but, on the contrary, instead of being *πνευματικός* and, in consequence, living *ἐν πνεύματι* and being disposed *κατὰ πνεῦμα*, he is still *ἐν σαρκί*, and still thinks, judges, is minded and acts *κατὰ σάρκα*.² The *ψυχικός* is accordingly as such also *σαρκικός*, but every *σαρκικός* is not as such still or once more a *ψυχικός*, not yet having the Spirit, or having lost Him again. The *expositors* commonly do *not* enter upon *any* distinction between *σάρκινος* and *σαρκικός*, *either* (so the majority) reading *σαρκικοῖς* in ver. 1 also, *or* (Rückert, Pott) arbitrarily giving out that the two words are alike in meaning. The distinction between them and *ψυχικός* also is passed over in utter silence by *many* (such as Rosenmüller, Flatt, Billroth), while *others*, in an arbitrary way, make *σάρκινος* and *σαρκικ.* *sometimes* to be *milder* than *ψυχικός* (Bengel, Rückert, holding that in *σαρκ.* there is more of the weakness, in *ψυχ.* more of the opposition to what is higher), *sometimes* to be *stronger* (Osiander; while Theophylact holds the former to be *παρὰ φύσιν*, the latter *κατὰ φύσιν*, and the pneumatic *ὑπὲρ φύσιν*), or *sometimes*, lastly, refer the latter to the lower *intelligence*, and the former to the

¹ According to Hofmann,—who, for the rest, defines the two notions with substantial correctness,—the distinction between *σάρκινος* and *σαρκικός* answers to that between *εἶναι ἐν σαρκί* and *κατὰ σάρκα*, Rom. viii. 5, 8. But the latter two phrases differ from each other, not in their real meaning, but only in the form of representation.—Holsten, too, *z. Ev. d. Paul. u. Petr.* p. 397 f., has in substance hit the true distinction

between *σάρκινος* and *σαρκικός*.

² Ewald says truly, that the strict distinction between *spiritual* and *fleshly* came in first with Christianity itself. But so, too, the sharply-defined notion of the *ψυχικός* could only be brought out by the contrast of Christianity, because it is the opposite of the *πνευματικός*, and cannot therefore occupy a middle place between the two former notions.

lower *moral* condition as given up to the desires (Locke, Wolf, and others). — ὡς νηπίοις ἐν Χριστῷ] statement justifying the foregoing ὡς σαρκ. by setting forth the character of their Christian condition as it had been at that time to which οὐκ ἠδυνήθην κ.τ.λ. looks back. The phrase denotes those who, in their relation to Christ (in Christianity), are still children under age, *i.e.* mere beginners. The opposite is τέλειοι ἐν Χ., Col. i. 28. See, regarding the analogous use in Rabbinical writers of נִינְקִי (sugentes), Schoettgen *in loc.*; Wetstein on 1 Pet. ii. 2; Lightfoot, *Hor.* p. 162; and for that of נִטְנִי, Wetstein on Matt. x. 42. Before baptism a man is yet without connection with Christ, but *through* baptism he enters into this fellowship, and is now, in the first instance, a νήπιος ἐν Χριστῷ, *i.e.* an *infans* as yet in relation to Christianity, who as such receives the elementary instruction suitable for him (the γάλα of ver. 2). The εὐαγγελίζεσθαι, on the other hand, which leads on to baptism, is *preparatory*, giving rise to faith, and forming the medium through which their calling takes place; and accordingly it has *not* yet to do with νήπιοι ἐν Χριστῷ. The inference is a mistaken one, therefore (on the part of Rückert), that Paul has in mind here a *second* residence in Corinth not recorded in the Acts. His readers could not understand this passage, any more than ii. 1, otherwise than of the apostle's *first* arrival, of *the* time, consequently, in which he founded the Corinthian church, when he instructed those who gave ear to his εὐαγγελίζεσθαι in the elements of Christianity. — By ἐν Χριστῷ is expressed the specific field to which the notion of νηπιότης is confined; viewed *apart from* Christ, he, who as a new convert is yet a νήπιος, may be an adult, or an old man. Comp. on Col. i. 28.

Ver. 2. Keeping to the same figure (comp. Heb. v. 12; Philo, *de agric.* p. 301), he designates as γάλα: τὴν εἰσαγωγικὴν καὶ ἀπλουστέραν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου διδασκαλίαν (Basil. *Hom.* I. p. 403, ed. Paris, 1638), see Heb. v. 12, vi. 1 f., and as βρῶμα: the further and higher instruction, the σοφία, which, as distinguished from the γνῶσιν τὴν ἐκ κατηχήσεως (Clemens Alexandrinus), is taught among the τέλειοι (ii. 6 ff.). Comp. Suicer, *Thes.* I. p. 721, 717. Wetstein *in loc.*¹ — ἐδύνασθε] *Ye were not yet strong and vigorous.* What weakness is meant, the context shows: in the figure, that of the body; in its application, that of the mind and spirit. Comp. regarding this absolute use of δύναμαι, δυνατός κ.τ.λ. (which makes any supplementing of it by ἐσθίειν βρῶμα and the like quite superfluous), Dem. 484, 25, 1187, 8; Aesch. p. 40. 39; Plato, *Men.* p. 77 B, *Prot.* p. 326 C; Xen. *Anab.* iv. 5. 11, vii. 6. 37; 1 Macc. v. 41; Schaefer, *ad Bos. Ell.* p. 267 ff. — ἀλλ' οὐδὲ ἐτι νῦν δύν.] ἀλλ' οὐδέ, *yea, not even.* See Fritzsche, *ad Marc.* p. 157. Herm. *ad Eurip. Suppl.* 121, Add. 975. That Paul, notwithstanding this remark, does give a section of the higher wisdom in chap. xv., is to be explained from the apologetic aim of that chapter (xv. 12), which did not *allow* him to treat the subject in an elementary style. There is no self-contradiction here, but an exception demanded by the circumstances. For the profound development

¹ As regards the *zeugma* (comp. Homer, *Il.* viii. 546; *Odyssey*, xx. 312; Hesiod. *Theog.* 640), see Bremi, *ad Lys. Exc.* III. p. 437 f.;

Winer, p. 578 [E. T. 777]; Kühner, *ad Xen. Anab.* iv. 5. 8; also Nägelsbach on the *Iliad*, p. 179, ed. 3.

of the doctrine of the resurrection in chap. xv. belonged really to the *βρῶμα* (comp. ii. 9), and rises high above that elementary teaching concerning the resurrection, with which every Jew was acquainted, and which Paul himself so often gave without thereby speaking *ἐν τελείῳ*, whence also it is rightly placed in Heb. vi. 1 among the first rudiments of Christian doctrine.

Ver. 3. *Σαρκικοί*] see on ver. 1. — *ὅπου*] equivalent seemingly to *quandoquidem* (see Vigerus, ed. Herm. 431) ; but the conditioning state of things is *locally* conceived. Comp. Heb. ix. 16, x. 18 ; 4 Macc. ii. 14, vi. 34, xiv. 11 ; Plato, *Tim.* p. 86 E ; the passages from Xenophon cited by Sturz. III. p. 307 ; Herod. i. 68 ; Thuc. viii. 27, 2, viii. 96. 1 ; Isocrates, *Paneg.* 186. — *ζῆλος*] *Jealousy*. — *κατὰ ἄνθρ.*] *after the fashion of men*. Comp. on Rom. iii. 5 ; often, too, in classical writers, *e.g.* *κατ' ἄνθρ. φρονεῖν* (Soph. *Aj.* 747, 764). The contrast here is to the mode of life conformed to the Divine Spirit ; hence not different from *κατὰ σάρκα* in Rom. viii. 4. — Respecting the relation to each other of the three words *ζῆλ.*, *ἔρ.*, *διχοστ.*, see Theophylact : *πατὴρ γὰρ ὁ ζῆλος τῆς ἐριδος, αὐτὴ δὲ τὰς διχοστασίας γεννᾷ*. — On *οὐχί*, comp. Bengel : “*nam Spiritus non fert studium partium humanarum.*” On the contrary, *ζῆλος κ.τ.λ.* are ranked expressly among the *ἔργα τῆς σαρκός*, Gal. v. 20.

Ver. 4. *Γάρ*] explanatory by exhibiting the state of contention *in concreto*. — *ἄνθρ.*] with a pregnant emphasis : are ye not *men*? *i.e.* according to the context : are ye not persons, who are absorbed in the unspiritual natural ways of men—in whose thoughts and strivings the divine element of life is wanting? Comp. Xen. *Anab.* vi. 1. 26 : *ἄνθρωπός εἰμι* (I am a weak, fallible man). What determines the shade of meaning in such cases is not anything in the word itself, but the connection. Comp. 1 Pet. iv. 2. The specific reference here has its basis in the preceding *κατὰ ἄνθρωπον περιπατεῖτε*, hence there is no ground for rejecting the reading *ἄνθρωποι*, with Fritzsche (*de conform. N. T. Lachm.* p. 48), as a *lectio insulsa* (comp. also Reiche), or for misinterpreting it, with Hofmann, into “*that they are surely men at all events and nothing less.*” This latter rendering brings in the idea, quite foreign to this passage, of the *dignity* of man, and that in such a way as if the interrogative apodosis were *adversative* (*ἀλλ' οὐκ* or *οὐ μέντοι*). — It may be added that Paul names only the *two* parties : *ἐγὼ . . . Παύλου* and *ἐγὼ Ἀπολλώ*, not giving an *imperfect* enumeration for the sake of the *μετασχηματισμός* which follows (iv. 6—so, arbitrarily, de Wette and others), but because in this section of the Epistle he has to do just with the antagonism of the *Apollos-party* to himself and to those who, against his will, called themselves after him ; hence also he makes the *μετασχηματισμός*, in iv. 6, with reference to himself and Apollos alone. — *ἐγὼ μέν*] This *μέν* does not stand in a logical relation to the following *δέ*. An inexactitude arising from the lively way in which thought follows thought, just as in classical writers too, from a like reason, there is often a want of exactly adjusted correspondence between *μέν* and *δέ* (Breitenbach, *ad Xen. Hier.* i. 9 ; Baumelein, *Partik.* p. 168 f.).

Vv. 5–15. Discussion of the position occupied by the two teachers : *The two have no independent merit whatsoever* (vv. 5–7 ; *each will receive his*

reward according to his own work (vv. 8, 9) ; and, more especially, *a definitive recompense in the future, according to the quality of his work, awaits the teacher who carries on the building upon the foundation already laid* (vv. 10–15). The aim of this discussion is stated in iv. 6.

Ver. 5. οὖν] *Now, igitur*, introduces the question as an inference from the state of party-division just referred to, so that the latter is seen to be the presupposition on which the question proceeds. See Klotz, *ad Devar.* p. 719 : “Such being the state of things, I am forced to propound the question,” etc. Rückert thinks that Paul makes his *readers* ask : But now, if Paul and Apollos are not our heads, what are they then ? Paul, however, is in the habit of indicating counter-questions expressly as such (xv. 35 ; Rom. ix. 19, *al.*). — τί] more significant than τις ; comp. ver. 7. The question is, *what*, as respects their position, are they ? Comp. Plato, *Rep.* p. 332 E, 341 D.—διάκονοι] They are *servants*, and therefore not fitted and destined to be heads of parties ; ἄλλος ἐστὶν ὁ δεσπότης, ἡμεῖς ἐκείνων δοῦλοι, Theodoret. — δι’ ὧν] “*per quos, non in quos*,” Bengel. Comp. John i. 7. They are but *causae ministeriales* in the hand of God. — ἐπιστεύς.] as in xv. 2, 11 ; Rom. xiii. 11.¹ — καί] *and that*. καὶ . . . ἔδωκεν is not to be joined with ver. 6 (Mosheim, Markland, *ad Lys.* XII. p. 560 f.), seeing that in ver. 7 no regard is paid to this καὶ . . . ἔδωκεν. — ἐκάστῳ ὡς] the emphasis is on ἐκάστ., as in vii. 17 and Rom. xii. 3. — ὁ Κύριος] correlative to the διάκονοι, is here *God*, not *Christ* (Theophylact ; also Rückert, who appeals to Eph. iv. 7, 11), as what follows—in particular vv. 9, 10—proves. Comp. 2 Cor. vi. 4. — As respects the ἀλλ’ ἢ of the *Textus receptus* : *nisi* (which makes the question continue to the end of the verse ; comp. Eccclus. xxii. 12) see on Luke xii. 51 ; 2 Cor. i. 13.

Vv. 6, 7. Statement of the difference in the διακονία of the two, and of the success of the ministry of both as dependent upon God, so that no one at all had any independent standing, but only God. Therewith Paul proceeds to point out the *impropriety* of the *party-relation* which men had taken up towards the two teachers. — ἐφύτευσα κ.τ.λ.] We are not to suppose the *object* left indefinite (de Wette) ; on the contrary, it emerges out of δι’ ὧν ἐπιστεύσατε, ver. 5, namely : *the faith of the Corinthian community*. This is conceived of as a *tree* (comp. Plato, *Phaedr.* p. 276 E) which was *planted* by Paul, inasmuch as he first brought the Corinthians to believe and founded the church ; but *watered*² by Apollos, inasmuch as he had subsequently exerted himself in the way of confirming and developing the faith of the church, and for the increase of its numbers ; and lastly, blessed with *growth* by God, inasmuch as it was under His influence τῆς γὰρ αὐτοῦ χάριτος τὸ κατόρθωμα, Theodoret) that the work of both had success and prospered. This making it to grow is the effect of grace, without which the “*granum a primo sationis momento esset instar lapilli*,” Bengel.

¹ *Ye have become believers*, which is to be understood here in a relative sense, both as respected the beginning and the furtherance of faith. See ver. 6. The becoming a believer comprehends different stages of

development. Comp. John ii. 11, xi. 15.

² Augustine, *Ep.* 48, and several of the Fathers make ἐπότισεν refer in a totally inappropriate way to *baptism*.

Comp. Acts xvi. 14, xiv. 27 ; 1 Cor. xv. 10. — ἐστὶ τι] may be taken to mean : *is anything of importance, anything worth speaking of* (Acts v. 36 ; Gal. ii. 6, vi. 3. Plato. *Phaedr.* p. 242 E, *Gorg.* p. 472 A, *Symp.* p. 173 B ; Xen. *Mem.* ii. 1. 12). It is more in accordance, however, with the decided tone of hostility to all human estimation which marks the whole context to take τι in quite a general sense (comp. x. 19), so that of both in and by themselves (in comparison with God) it is said : they are *nothing*. — ἀλλ' ὁ αὐξ. Θεός] *sc.* τὰ πάντα ἐστὶ (1 Cor. xv. 28 ; Col. iii. 11), which, according to the apostle's intention, is to be drawn from what has been already said. An abbreviated form of the contrast, with which comp. vii. 19, and see generally Kühner, II. p. 604 ; Stallbaum, *ad Rep.* p. 366 D, 561 B. Theophylact says well : διδάζας, ὅτι Θεὸς ὧν δεῖ μόνον προσέχειν, καὶ εἰς αὐτὸν ἀνατιθέναι πάντα τὰ συμβαίνοντα ἀγαθά.

Vv. 8, 9. *The planter, on the other hand, and the waterer are one : each of them, however (and here we pass on to the new point of the recompense of the teachers), will receive his own reward, etc.* — ἐν εἰσιν] the one is not something different from the other, that is to say generically, as respects the relation-defined (xi. 5 ; John x. 30, xvii. 11, 21) here : in so far both have one and the same official character, namely, as *workers in the service of God*. Theodoret : κατὰ τὴν ὑπουργίαν. — ἕκαστος δὲ κ.τ.λ.] πρὸς γὰρ τὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἔργον παραβαλλόμενοι ἓν εἰσὶν· ἐπεὶ πόνον ἕνεκεν (*i.e.* in respect of the *pains and labour* expended) οὐκ εἰσὶν, ἀλλὰ ἕκαστος κ.τ.λ., Chrysostom. — ἰδιον] both times with emphasis. Bengel puts it happily : “congruens iteratio ; anti-theton ad unum.” The λήψεται, however, refers to the recompense at the last judgment, ver. 13 ff. — Ver. 9 gives now the *proof*, not for both halves of ver. 8, of which the first has been already disposed of in the preceding statement (in opposition to Hofmann), but for the new thought ἕκαστος . . . κόπον introduced by δέ. The emphasis of proof lies wholly on the word thrice put foremost, Θεοῦ. For since it is *God* whose helpers we are (“eximium elogium ministerii,” Calvin), *God* whose tillage-field, *God* whose building ye are : therefore it cannot be otherwise than that that ἕκαστος . . . κόπον must hold good, and none lack his reward according to his labour (“*secundum laborem, non propter laborem*,” Calovius). — Θεοῦ συνεργοί] for we, your teachers, labour *with God*, the supreme Lord and Fosterer of the church, at *one* work, which is simply the furtherance of the church. The explanation : workers who work *with each other* for God's cause (Estius by way of suggestion, Bengel, Flatt, Heydenreich, Olshausen), is linguistically erroneous (see 1 Thess. iii. 2 ; Rom. xvi. 3, 9, 21 ; Phil. ii. 25, iv. 3 ; 2 Cor. i. 24 ; 2 Macc. xiv. 5 ; Plato, *Def.* p. 414 A ; Dem. 68. 27, 884. 2 ; Plut. *Per.* 31 ; Bernhardt, p. 171 ; Kühner, II. p. 172), and fails to appreciate that lofty conception of a δοῦλος Θεοῦ. — Θεοῦ γεώργ. and Θεοῦ οἰκ. set before us the Corinthian church, in so far as it is the object of the ministerial service of Christian teachers, under the twofold image of a *field for tillage* (γεώργ., Strabo, xiv. p. 671 ; Theag. in Schol. on Pind. *Nem.* iii. 21 ; Prov. xxiv. 30, xxxi. 16), which belongs to God and is cultivated, and as a *building* belonging to God (Eph. ii. 21), which is being carried up to completion.

Ver. 10. The former of these images (γεώργ.) has been the underlying

thought in what has hitherto been said (vv. 6-8) ; the second and new figure (οἰκοδ.) is now retained in what follows up to ver. 15, the course of thought being this, that Paul, first of all, states the difference between his own work and that of others at this building, and then passes on to the responsibility which he who would build after him takes upon himself. — The χάρις is not the *apostolic office*, with which Paul was graced (Rom. xii. 3, xv. 15 ; Gal. i. 15, *al.*), for it was not exclusively an apostle who was required for the founder of a church (Rome, Colossae), but the *special endowment of grace*, which he had received from God to fit him for his calling ; and he was conscious in himself that he was qualified and destined just for the right *laying of the foundation*, Rom. xv. 20. — The *significant weight* of the words κατὰ . . . δοθ. μοι is to express humility in making the utterance which follows. Comp. Chrysostom and Theophylact. — ὡς σοφὸς ἀρχιτ.] proceeding as such an one would, going to work in this capacity. To it belongs the *right laying of the foundation in strict accordance with the design* of the building, the reverse of which would be the part of an *unskilful architect*. Without a foundation no man builds ; without a *proper* foundation no σοφός, *i.e.* no one who understands the art (Ex. xxxv. 10). Comp. Plato, *Phil.* p. 17 C, *de virt.* b.*376 A ; Pind. *Pyth.* iii. 115, v. 115 ; Soph. *Ant.* 362. But Paul by the *grace of God* was a σοφὸς ἀρχιτέκτων. — What he understands by such a foundation, he himself tells us in ver. 11, namely, *Jesus Christ*, without whom (both in an *objective* sense : without whose appearing and work, and in a *subjective* : without appropriating whom in conscious faith ; see ver. 11) a Christian society could not come into existence at all. This foundation *Paul had laid*, inasmuch as he had made *Christ to be possessed by the conscious faith of the Corinthian church*. Comp. on Eph. ii. 20. — θεμέλιον] The masculine ὁ θεμέλιος (see ver. 11 ; hence wrongly held by Ewald to be *neuter* here), attributed by the old grammarians to the κοινή (see Wetstein on ver. 11), is commonly found only in the plural, and that as early as Thuc. i. 93. 1. In the singular, 2 Tim. ii. 19 ; Rev. xxi. 19 ; Machon in Athen. viii. p. 346 A ; 3 Esdr. vi. 20. — ἄλλος δὲ ἐποικοδ.] By this is meant not *merely* Apollos, but any later teacher of the Corinthians whatever (comp. ἕκαστος) : “Not my task, however, but that of *another*, is the building up, the carrying on the building.” — πῶς] *i.e.* here : *with what materials*.¹ See vv. 12, 13. Without figurative language : “*Let each take heed what sort of doctrine (as regards substance and form) he applies, in order to advance and develop more fully the church, founded upon Jesus Christ, in its saving knowledge and frame of life.*” See on ver. 12. The figure is *not changed*, as has been often thought (“Ante fideles dixerat aedificium Dei, nunc aedificium vocat ea, quae in ecclesia Christiana a doctoribus docentur,” Grotius ; comp. Rosenmüller) ; but the οἰκοδομή is, as before, *the church*, which, being founded upon Christ (see above), is further built up, *i.e.* developed in the Christian faith and life (which may take place in a right or a

¹ According to de Wette, the force of the πῶς consists primarily in this, *that they simply carry on the building, and do not alter the foundation* (which was probably done

by the opponents of the apostle). But the carrying on of the building, so far as that is concerned, is *presupposed* in πῶς ἐποικοδομεῖ.

wrong way, see vv. 12, 13), by the teachings of the later teachers. In like manner is a house built up by the different building-materials upon the foundation laid for it.

Ver. 11. *Γάρ*] justifies the foregoing warning, in so far as it is given exclusively to the *upbuilder*: for with the layer of the foundation it is quite different, *he cannot otherwise than*, etc. ; but as regards the *upbuilder*, the case is, as ver. 12 ff. sets forth. We are not to bring in any intermediate thought to explain the *γάρ*, either with Billroth : “each, however, must bethink himself of carrying on the building ;” or, with Hofmann, that in the case of all others the question simply concerns a right building up. Rather we are to note that ver. 11 stands only in a preparatory relation to ver. 12, in which the varying *πῶς* of the *ἐποικοδομεῖν* is exhibited. — *δύναται*] *can*, not *may* (Grotius, Glass, and others, including Storr, Rosenmüller, Pott, Billroth) ; for it is the *Christian* church that is spoken of, whose structure is *incapable* of having another foundation. — *παρὰ τὸν κείμενον*] i.e. *different from that, which lies* already there. Respecting *παρά* after *ἄλλος* in this sense, see Krüger, *ad Dion.* p. 9 ; Stallbaum, *ad Phileb.* p. 51 ; Ast, *Lex. Plat.* III. p. 28. *The foundation already lying there*, however, is not that which *Paul* had laid (so most interpreters, resting on ver. 10 ; including de Wette, Neander, Maier, Hofmann) ; for his affirmation is *universal*, and if *no one* can lay another foundation than that which lies already there, *Paul*, of course, could not do so either, and therefore the *κείμενος* must have been in its place before the apostle himself laid his foundation. Hence the *κείμενος θεμέλιος* is that laid *by God* (so, rightly, Rückert and Olshausen), namely, *Jesus Christ Himself*, the *fundamentum essentiale*, He whom God sent, delivered up to death, raised again, and exalted, thereby making Him to be for us wisdom, righteousness, etc. (i. 30), or, according to a kindred figure, the corner-stone (Eph. ii. 20 ; Matt. xxi. 42 ; Acts iv. 10 f. ; 1 Pet. ii. 6). Comp. 1 Tim. iii. 16. This is the *objective foundation*, which *lies there* for the whole of Christendom. But this foundation *is laid* (ver. 10) by the founder of a church, inasmuch as he makes Christ to be appropriated by believers, to be the contents of their conscious faith, and thereby establishes them in the character of a Christian church ; that is the *doctrinal* laying of the foundation (*fundamentum dogmaticum*). — Observe further, that Paul says purposely *Ἰησοῦς Χριστός*, so as emphatically to designate the personal, historically manifested Christ. This *ὅς ἐστιν Ἰησοῦς Χριστός* is the sum of the fundamental Christian confession of faith, John xvii. 3 ; Phil. ii. 11 ; Acts iv. 10 ff.

Ver. 12. *Δέ*] continues the subject by contrasting the position of him who builds up with that of him who lays the foundation (ver. 11). It is a mistake, therefore, to put ver. 11 in parenthesis (Pott, Heydenreich, comp. Billroth). — In connection with this carrying on of the figure, it is to be noted—(1) that Paul is *not* speaking of *several buildings*,¹ as though the *θεμέλιος* were that not of a house, but of a *city* (Billroth) ; against which ver. 16 (see *in loc.*) is decisive, as is, further, the consideration that the idea of Christ's being the foundation of a *city* of God is foreign to the N. T. (2)

¹ So also Wetstein : “ Duo sunt aedificia, domus regia et casa rustici quae distinguuntur.”

The figure must not be drawn out beyond what the words convey (as Grotius, *e.g.*, does : “ Proponit ergo nobis domum, cujus parietes sint ex marmore, columnae partim ex auro partim ex argento, trabes ex ligno, fastigium vero ex stramine et culmo”). It sets before us, on the contrary, *a building rearing itself upon the foundation laid by the master-builder, for the erection of which the different workmen bring their several contributions of building materials, from the most precious and lasting down to the most mean and worthless.* The various specimens of building materials, set side by side in vivid asyndeton (Krüger and Kühner, *ad Xen. Anab.* ii. 4. 28 ; Winer, p. 484 [E. T. 653]), denote the various matters of doctrine propounded by teachers and brought into connection with faith in Christ, in order to develop and complete the Christian training of the church.¹ These are either, like gold, silver, and costly stones (marble and the like), of high value and imperishable duration, or else, like timber, hay, stubble (καλάμη, not equivalent to κάλαμος, a reed ; see Wetstein and Schleusner, *Thes.*), of little worth and perishable,² so that they—instead of, like the former, abiding at the Parousia in their eternal truth—come to nought, *i.e.* are shown not to belong to the ever-enduring ἀλήθεια, and form no part of the perfect knowledge (xiii. 12) which shall then emerge.³ Two things, however, are to be observed in connection with this interpretation—(1) that the several materials are not meant to point to specific dogmas that could be named, although we cannot fail to perceive, generally speaking, the graduated diversity of the constituent elements of the two classes ; (2) that the second class embraces in it no absolutely *anti-Christian* doctrines.⁴ To deny the first of these positions would but give rise to arbitrary definitions without warrant in the text ; to deny the second would run counter to the fact that the building was *upon the foundation*, and to the apostle's affirmation, αὐτὸς δὲ σωθήσεται, ver. 15. Billroth makes the strange objection to this interpreta-

¹ Luther's gloss is appropriate : “ This is said of *preaching and teaching*, by which faith is either strengthened or weakened.”

² Compare *Midr. Tillin*, 119. 51, of false teachers : “ Sicut foenum non durat, ita nec verba eorum stabunt in saeculum.”

³ So, in substance (explaining it of the different *doctrines*), Clemens Alexandrinus, Ambrosiaster, Sedulius, Lyra, Thomas, Cajetanus, Erasmus, Luther, Beza, Calvin, Piscator, Justiniani, Grotius, Estius, Calovius, Lightfoot, Stolz, Rosenmüller, Flatt, Heydenreich, Neander, de Wette, Osiander, Ewald, Maier. Comp. Theodoret : *τινὲς περὶ δογμάτων ταῦτα εἰρησθαι τῷ ἀποστόλῳ φασίν.*

⁴ Estius characterizes the second class well as “ *doctrina minus sincera minusque solida, veluti si sit humanis ac philosophicis aut etiam Judaicis opinionibus admixta plus satis, si curiosa magis quam utilis,*” etc. Comp. the *Paraphr.* of Erasmus, who refers specially to the “ *humanas constitutiunculas de cultu, de victu, de frigidis ceremoniis.*” They are, generally, all doctrinal develop-

ments, speculations, etc., which, although built into the fabric of doctrine in time, will not approve themselves at the final consummation on the day of the Lord, nor be taken in as elements in the perfect knowledge, but will then—instead of standing out under the test of that great catastrophe which shall end the history of all things, like the doctrines compared to gold, etc.—be shown to be no part of divine and saving truth, and so will fall away. Such materials, in greater or less degree, every *Church* will find in the system of doctrine built up for it by human hands. To learn more and more to recognize these, and to separate them from the rest in accordance with Scripture, is the task of that onward development, against which no church ought to close itself up till the day of the final crisis,—least of all the evangelical Lutheran church with its central principle regarding Scripture, a principle which determines and regulates its steadfastly Protestant character.

tion as a whole, that χρυσόν κ.τ.λ. cannot apply to the contents of the teaching, because Paul calls the latter the *foundation*. But that is in fact Christ, and not the further doctrinal teaching. In reply to the invalid objections urged by Hollmann (*Animadverss. ad cap. iii. et. xiii. Ep. Pauli prim. ad Cor.*, Lips. 1819) see Heydenreich and Rückert. Our exposition is, in fact, a *necessity*, because it alone keeps the whole figure in *harmony with itself* throughout. For if the *foundation*, which is laid, be the contents of the *first* preaching of the gospel, namely, *Christ*, then the *material wherewith the building is carried on* must be the contents of *the further instruction given*. It is out of keeping, therefore, to explain it, with Origen, Augustine, Jerome, Chrysostom, Theodoret, Theophylact, Photius, and more recently, Billroth, “of the *fruits* called forth *in the church* by the exercise among them of the office of teaching” (Billroth), of the morality or immorality of the hearers (Theodoret : gold, etc., denotes τὰ εἶδη τῆς ἀρετῆς ; wood, etc., τὰ ἐναντία τῆς ἀρετῆς, οἷς ὑπὲρπέπιστα τῆς γέννης τὸ πῦρ); or, again, of the worthy or unworthy *members of the church themselves*, who would be moulded by the teachers (Schott in Röhr’s *Magaz. für christl. Pred.* VIII. 1, p. 8 f., with Pelagius, Bengel, Hollmann, Pott). So, too, Hofmann *in loc.*; and previously in his *Schriftbeweis*, II. 2, p. 124. Both of these interpretations have, besides, this further consideration against them, that they do not harmonize in meaning with the figure of the watering formerly employed, whereas our exposition does. Moreover, if the ἔργον, which shall be *burned up* (ver. 15), be the relative *portion of the church*, it would not accord therewith that the teacher concerned, who has been the cause of this destruction, is, notwithstanding, to obtain *salvation* ; this would be at variance with the N. T. severity against all causing of offence, and with the responsibility of the teachers. Rückert gives up the attempt at a definite interpretation, contenting himself with the general truth : *Upon the manner and way, in which the office of teaching is discharged, does it depend whether the teacher shall have reward or loss ; he who builds on in right fashion upon a good foundation* (? rather : upon the foundation) *has reward therefrom ; he who would add what is unsuitable and unenduring, only harm and loss*. But by this there is simply *nothing* explained ; Paul assuredly did not mean anything so vague as this by his sharply outlined figure ; he must have had before his mind, *wherein consisted* the right carrying on of the building, and *what* were additions unsuitable and doomed to perish. Olshausen (comp. also Schrader) understands the passage not of the efficiency of the teachers, but of the (right or misdirected) *individual activity of sanctification on each part of each believer* in general. Wrongly so ; because, just as in ver. 6 ff. the planter and waterer, so here the founder and upbuilder *must* be teachers, and because the building is the *church* (ver. 9), which is *being built* (vv. 9, 10). And this conception of the church as a building with a personal foundation (Christ), and consisting of persons (comp. 2 Tim. ii. 20 ; 1 Pet. ii. 4 f.), remains quite unimpaired with our exegesis also (against Hofmann’s objection). For the further building upon the personal foundation laid, partly with gold, etc., partly with wood, etc., is just the labour of teaching, through which the development and enlargement of the church, which is made up of persons,

receive a character varying in value. The ἐποικοδομεῖν takes place on the persons *through* doctrines, which are the *building materials*.

Ver. 13. Apodosis : *So will what each has done on the building* (τὸ ἔργον) *not remain hidden* (φανερὸν γενήσ.). Then the ground of this assurance is assigned : ἡ γὰρ ἡμέρα δηλώσει, sc. ἐκάστου τὸ ἔργον. *The day is κατ' ἐξοχήν, the day of the Parousia* (comp. Heb. x. 24), which is obvious from what follows on to ver. 15. So, rightly, Tertullian, *contra Marc.* iv. 2 ; Origen, Cyprian, *Ep.* iv. 2 ; Lactantius, *Inst.* vii. 21 ; Hilarius, Ambrosiaster, Sedulius, Chrysostom, Theodoret, Theophylact, the Roman Catholics (some of whom, however, in the interests of purgatory, make it out to be the day of *death*), Bengel, and others, including Pott, Heydenreich, Billroth, Schott, Schrader, Rückert, Olshausen, de Wette, Osiander, Ewald, Hofmann. It is un-Pauline, and also against the context (for wood, etc., does not apply to the doctrines of the Judaizers alone), to interpret the phrase, with Hammond, Lightfoot, Gusset, Schoettgen, of the *destruction of Jerusalem*, which should reveal the nullity of the Jewish doctrines. The following expositions are alien to the succeeding context : of *time in general* (comp. *dies docebit* : χρόνος δίκαιον ἄνδρα δείκνυσιν μόνος, Sophocles, *Oed. Rex*, 608 ; Stob. *Ecl.* I. p. 234,—so Grotius, Wolf, Wetstein, Stolz, Rosenmüller, Flatt, and others) ; or of the *time of clear knowledge of the gospel* (Erasmus, Beza, Calvin, Vors-tius¹) ; or of the *dies tribulationis* (Augustine, Calovius, and others). — ὅτι ἐν πυρὶ ἀποκαλ.] We are neither to *read* here ὅτε² instead of ὅτι (Bos, Alberti), nor does the latter *stand for* the former (Pott), but it has a causative force : *because it is revealed in fire*,—the *day*, namely,³ not τὸ ἔργον, as Luther and the majority of interpreters (among them Heydenreich, Flatt, Schott, Neander) hold, following Ambrosiaster and Oecumenius ; for this would yield a tautology with what comes next. Bengel, joined by Osiander, imagines as the subject of the verb ὁ Κύριος, which can be evolved from ἡ ἡμέρα only by a very arbitrary process, since the whole context never speaks of Christ Himself. — ἐν πυρὶ] i.e. *encompassed with fire* (see Bernhardt, p. 209 ; Matthiae, p. 1340), so that fire is the element in which the revelation of that day takes place. For Christ, when His Parousia draws nigh, is to appear coming from heaven ἐν πυρὶ φλογός (2 Thess. i. 8 ; comp. Dan. vii. 9, 10 ; Mal. iv. 1), i.e. surrounded by flaming fire (which is not to be explained away, as is often done : *amid lightnings* ; rather comp. Ex. iii. 2 ff., xix. 18). This fire, however, is not, as Chrysostom would have it, that of Gehenna (Matt. vi. 22, 29, *al.*) ; for it is *in it* that Christ appears, and it seizes upon every ἔργον, even the golden, etc., and proves each, leaving the one unharmed, but consuming the other. The correct supplying of ἡ ἡμέρα with ἀποκαλ. supersedes at once the older Roman Catholic interpretation about *purgatory* (against which see, besides, Scaliger and Calovius), as the correct

¹ Were this so, the text would need to contain an antithetic designation of the present time as *night*. And in that case, too, it would surely be the clear day of the Parousia which would be meant, as in Rom. xiii. 12.

² As regards the fact of the two words being often put the one for the other by transcribers, see Schaefer, *ad Greg. Cor.* p. 491 ; Kühner, *ad Xen. Anab.* i. 4. 2.

³ Estius, Pott, Billroth, Rückert, Olshausen, de Wette, Ewald, Hofmann.

view of ἡ ἡμέρα sets aside the explanations of the *wrath of God* against the Jews (Lightfoot), of the *Holy Spirit*, who tries “quae doctrina sit instar auri et quae instar stipulae” (Calvin), of the fire of *trial and persecution* (Rosenmüller, Flatt, following Augustine, *de civ. Dei*, xxi. 26, Erasmus, and many old commentators ; comp. Isa. xlviii. 10 ; 1 Pet. i. 7, iv. 12 ; Ecclus. ii. 5), and of a *progressive process of purifying the mind of the church* (Neander). The idea rather is : “The decision on the day of the Parousia will show how each has worked as a teacher ; if any one has taught what is excellent and imperishable, that, as belonging to the divine ἀλήθεια, will stand this decision and survive ; if any one has taught what is worthless and perishable, that will by the decision of that day cease to have any standing, fall away, and come to nought” (comp. on ver. 12). This idea Paul, in accordance with his figure of a building, clothes in this *form* : “At the Parousia the fire, in which it reveals itself, will seize upon the building ; and then through this fiery ordeal those parts of the fabric which are of gold, silver, and precious stones will pass unharmed ; but those consisting of wood, hay, and stubble will be burnt up.” — ἀποκαλύπτεται] The result of this act of revelation is the δηλώσει already spoken of. The *present* marks the event as beyond doubt ; the sentence is an axiom. — καὶ ἐκάστου κ.τ.λ.] not to be connected with ὅτι (Rückert), but with the clause in the *future*, ἡ γὰρ ἡμε. δηλώσει. Is ἔργον in the *nominative* (Theophylact, Oecumenius, and many others) or *accusative* (Billroth, Schott, de Wette, Osiander, Ewald) ? The former is more in harmony with the sense of the passage, for so ὅπ. ἐστὶ is made to appear not as merely inserted, but in its befitting emphasis. For the form of the statement advances from the general to the particular : *the day will show it*, namely, what each has wrought ; *and* (now follows the definite specification of the *quality*) *what is the character of the work of each*, — *the fire itself will test*. — τὸ πῦρ αὐτό] *ignis ipse* (see the critical remarks), *i.e.* the fire (in which the ἀποκάλυψις of the day takes place) *by its own proper working*, without intervention from *any other quarter*. Respecting the position of αὐτό after πῦρ, see Bornemann, *ad Xen. Mem.* ii. 5. 1. Were we to take it as the *object* of δοκιμάσει, pointing back to the preceding statement (Hofmann), it would be superfluous in itself, and less in keeping with the terse, succinct mode of expression of this whole passage. — δοκιμάσει] “*pro-babit, non : purgabit.*” Hic locus ignem *purgatorium* non modo non foveat, sed plane extinguit,” Bengel.

Vv. 14, 15. Manner and result of this δοκιμάσει. — μενεῖ] *will remain unharmed* ; not μένει (*Text. recept.*) for κατακαήσεται, in ver. 15, corresponds to it. — μισθὸν λήψ.] namely, for his work at the building (without figure : *teacher's recompense*), from God, at whose οἰκοδομή he has laboured. Rückert holds that Paul steps decidedly out of his figure here ; for the builder is not paid only after his work has stood the test of fire uninjured. But the building is still being worked at until the Parousia, so that *before* that event no recompense can be given. The fire of the Parousia seizes upon the building still in process of being completed, and now *he* alone receives recompense whose work, which has been carried on hitherto, shows itself proof against the fire.—As regards the form κατακαήσεται, *shall be burned down* (comp.

2 Pet. iii. 10), instead of the Attic κατακαυθήσεται, see Thom. M. p. 511. — ζημιωθήσεται] sc. τὸν μισθόν, i.e. *frustrabitur praemio*. Comp. on ζημιουῖσθαι τι, to suffer loss of anything, Matt. xvi. 26 ; Luke ix. 25 ; Phil. iii. 8. See also Valckenaer, *ad Herod.* vii. 39. The thought is : He will, as a punishment, not receive the recompense which he would otherwise have received as a teacher. We are not to think of *deposition from office* (Grotius), seeing that it is the time of the Parousia that is spoken of. To take the ζημ., with the Vulgate, *et al.* : *without* object, so that the sense would be : “ *he shall have loss from it* ” (Hofmann), gives too indefinite a conception, and one which would require first of all to have its meaning defined more precisely from the antithesis of μισθ. λήψεται. — αὐτὸς δὲ σωθήσεται, οὕτω δὲ ὡς διὰ πυρός] In order not to be misunderstood, as if by his ζημιωθήσεται he were denying to such teachers share in the future Messianic salvation at all, whereas he is only refusing to assign to them the higher rank of blessedness, blessedness as teachers, Paul adds : *Yet he himself shall be saved, but so as through fire*. Αὐτός refers to the τὸν μισθόν, which is to be supplied as the object of ζημ. : although he will lose his *recompense*, yet *he himself*, etc. Rückert is wrong in thinking that the builder is now regarded as the *inhabitant* of the house. Paul does not handle his figure in this confused way, but has before his mind the builder as still busied in the house with the work which he has been carrying on : all at once the fire seizes the house ; he flees and yet finds safety, but not otherwise than as a man is saved through and from the midst of fire. Such an escape is wont to be coupled with *fear and painful injury* ; hence the *idea* of this figurative representation is : *He himself, however, shall obtain the Messianic σωτηρία*,¹ yet still only in such a way that the catastrophe of the Parousia will be fraught with the highest anxiety for him, and will not elapse without sensibly impairing his inheritance of blessing. He shall obtain the σωτηρία, but only a lower grade of it, so that he will belong to those whom Jesus calls “ *the last* ” (Matt. xx. 16 ; Mark x. 31). The main point in this interpretation, namely, that σωθήσ. refers to the Messianic σωτηρία, is accepted by most expositors ; but several, such as Rosenmüller and Flatt, take the future as indicating the *possibility* (a view which the very fact of the two preceding futures should have sufficed to preclude), and Grotius² has foisted in a *problematical* sense into the word (equally against the definitely assertive sense of those futures) : “ *In summo erit salutis suae periculo. Etsi eam adipiscetur (quod boni ominis causa sperare mavult apostolus) non fiet id sine gravi moestitia ac dolore.* ” It is a common mistake to understand ὡς διὰ πυρός in the sense of a *proverb* (*by a hair's-breadth*, see Grotius and Wetstein *in loc.* ; Valckenaer, p. 157 ; and comp. Amos iv. 11 ; Zech. iii. 2 ; Jude 23), because the passage, looking back to ver. 13, really *sets before us a conflagration* (ὡς, as in John i. 14). It may be

¹ For he has after all held to the foundation. The Messianic salvation is the *gift of grace* to those who believe in Christ as such ; while the teacher's blessedness, as μισθός (which the general σωτηρία in and by itself is *not*), must be some specially high

grade of blessing in the Messiah's kingdom. Comp. Dan. xii. 3 ; Matt. xix. 28.

² So before him Theodore of Mopsuestia : ἀλλὰ καὶ ἂν σώζεται διὰ τινὰ ἑτέραν αἰτίαν σώζειν αὐτὸν δυναμένην.

added that there is no ground for bringing into the conception the fire of *the wrath of God* (Hofmann), since, according to the text, it is the *selfsame* fire which seizes upon the work of *the one and of the other*, in the one case however, proving it to be abiding, and in the other consuming it. Bengel illustrates the matter well by the instance of a shipwrecked man : “*ut mercator naufragus amissa merce et lucro servatur per undas.*” Other commentators, again (Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Theophylact), understand it to mean : *He shall be preserved, but so only as one is preserved through the fire of hell*, that is to say, eternally tormented therein. So too of late, in substance, Maier. But the interpretation is decidedly erroneous ; first, because, according to ver. 13, $\pi\upsilon\rho$ cannot be allowed to have any reference to the fire of hell ; secondly, because $\sigma\acute{\omega}\zeta\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$, which is the standing expression for being saved with the salvation of the Messiah, can least of all be used to denote anything else in a picture representing the decision of the Parousia.¹ This last consideration tells also against Schott’s explanation (*l.c.* p. 17) : “*He himself shall indeed not be utterly destroyed on that account ; he remains, but it is as one who has passed through flaming fire (seriously injured),*” by which is denoted the divine award of punishment which awaits such a teacher at the day of judgment. It may also be urged against the view in question, that the sentence of punishment, since it *dooms to the fire*, cannot be depicted in the figure as a *having passed through the fire*. (H)

Vv. 16–23. *Warning address to the readers*, comprising—(1) preparatory statement reminding them of the guilt of sectarian conduct as a destroying of the temple of God, vv. 16, 17,—verses which Chrysostom, Theophylact, and others quite mistakenly refer to the incestuous person ; then (2) exhortation to put a stop to this conduct at its source by renouncing their fancied wisdom, vv. 18–28, and to give up what formed the most prominent feature of their sectarianism,—the parading of human authorities, which was, in truth, utterly opposed to the Christian standpoint.

Vv. 16, 17. $\text{Ὁὐκ οἶδατε ὅτι κ.τ.λ.}$] could be regarded as said in proof of ver. 15 (Billroth), only if Chrysostom’s interpretation of $\sigma\omega\theta\acute{\eta}\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$. . . $\pi\upsilon\rho\acute{o}\varsigma$, or Schott’s modification of it (see on ver. 15), were correct.² Since this, however, is not the case, and since the notion of $\sigma\omega\theta\acute{\eta}\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$, although limited by $\text{οὕτω δὲ ὡς διὰ πῦρ}$, cannot for a moment be even relatively included under the $\phi\theta\epsilon\rho\epsilon\acute{\iota} \tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\nu \delta\ \Theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$ of ver. 17, because the $\phi\theta\omicron\rho\acute{\alpha}$ is the very *opposite* of the $\sigma\omega\tau\eta\rho\acute{\iota}\alpha$ (Gal. vi. 8), this mode of bringing out the connection must be given up. Were we to assume with *other* expositors that Paul passes on here from the teachers who build upon the foundation to such as are *anti-Christian*, “*qui fundamentum evertunt et aedificium destruunt,*”³ we should in that case feel the want at once of some express indication of the destroying of the *foundation*,—which, for that matter, did not take place in

¹ Hence, also, it will not do to refer $\alphaὐ\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$, with Otto, *Pastoralbr.* p. 144 f., to the $\theta\epsilon\mu\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\iota\omicron\varsigma$, which will remain *safe*, but covered over with refuse, ashes, and the like, which he holds to be indicated by ὡς διὰ πῦρ .

² This holds, too, against Ewald’s way of apprehending the connection here : Are

any surprised that the lot of such a teacher should be so hard a one ! Let them consider how sacred is the field in which he works.

³ Estius and others, including Michaelis, Rosenmüller, Flatt, Pott, Hofmann.

Corinth,—and also, and more especially, of some indication of the relation of antithesis subsisting between this passage and what has gone before. The apostle would have needed at least, in order to be understood, to have proceeded immediately after ver. 15 somewhat in this way : *εἰ δέ τις φθείρει κ.τ.λ.* No ; in ver. 16 we have a *new* part of the argument begun ; and it comes in all the more powerfully without link of connection with the foregoing. Hitherto, that is to say, Paul has been presenting to his readers—that he may make them see the wrong character of their proud partisan-conduct (iv. 6)—the relation of the teachers to the church as an *οἰκοδομὴ Θεοῦ*. But he has not yet set before their minds *what sort of an οἰκοδ. Θεοῦ* they are, namely, the *temple* of God (hence *ναός* is emphatic). This he does now, in order to make them feel yet more deeply the criminality of their sectarian arrogance, when, after ending the foregoing discussion about the teachers, he starts afresh : *Is it unknown to you¹ what is the nature of this building of God, that ye are God's temple?* etc. The question is one of *amazement* (for the state of division among the Corinthians seemed to imply such ignorance, comp. v. 6, vi. 15 f., ix. 13, 24) ; and it contains, along with the next closely connected verse, the sudden, startling preface—arresting the mind of the readers with its holy solemnity—to the exhortation which is to follow, ver. 18 ff. — *ναὸς Θεοῦ*] not : *a temple of God*, but *the temple of God*.² For Paul's thought is not (as Theodoret and others hold) that there are several temples of God (which would be quite alien to the time-hallowed idea of the one national temple, which the apostle must have had, see Philo, *de monarch.* 2, p. 634), but that each Christian community is in a spiritual way, *sensu mystico*, the temple of Jehovah, the realized idea of that temple, its *ἀληθινόν*. There are not, therefore, several temples, but several churches, each one of which is the same true spiritual temple of God. Comp. Eph. ii. 21 ; Ignatius, *ad Eph.* 9 ; 1 Pet. ii. 5 ; Barnab. 4 ; also regarding Christian persons individually, as in vi. 19, see Ignatius, *ad Phil.* 7. This accordingly is different from the heathen conception of pious men being *temples* (in the plural). Valer. Max. iv. 7. 1, *al.*, in Elsner and Wetstein. — *καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα*] appends in how far (*καί* being the explicative *and*) they are *ναὸς Θεοῦ*. God, as He dwelt in the actual temple by the *שכינה* (Buxtorf, *Lex. Talm.* p. 2394), dwells in the ideal temple of the Christian church by the gracious presence, working and ruling in it, of *His Spirit*, in whom God communicates Himself ; for the Spirit dwells and rules in the hearts of believers (Rom. viii. 9, 11 ; 2 Tim. i. 14). But we are not on this ground to make *ἐν ὑμῖν* refer to the *individuals* (Rückert and many others) ; for the *community* as such (ver. 17) is the *temple* (2 Cor. vi. 16 f. ; Eph. ii. 21 f. ; Ezek. xxxvii. 27). — *Ναός* did *not* need the *article*, which comes in only retrospectively in ver. 17, just because there is but *one ναὸς Θεοῦ* in existence. Comp. 2 Cor. vi. 16 ; Eph. ii. 21 ; Wisd. iii. 14 ; 2 Macc. xiv. 35 ; Ecclus. li. 44.

¹ This lively interrogative turn of the discourse, frequent though it is in this Epistle, occurs only twice in the rest of Paul's writings, namely, in Rom. vi. 16, xi. 2.

² [Here the Canterbury Revision seems to have erred in using the indefinite article.—T. W. C.]

Ver. 17. Εἰ τις . . . ἅγιός ἐστιν] This is spoken of the *real* temple ; the application to the church as the *ideal* one is not made until the οἰτινές ἐστε ὑμεῖς which follows. It is an anticipation of the course of the argument to understand, as here already meant, the latter *New Testament* place of the divine presence (Hofmann). — Every Levitical defilement was considered a *destroying* of the temple, as was every injury to the buildings, and even every act of carelessness in the watching and superintendence of it. See Maimonides, *de domo electa*, i. 10, vii. 7. Deyling, *Obss.* II. p. 505 ff. — φθερεῖ] placed immediately after φθείρει at the head of the apodosis, to express with emphasis the adequacy of the recompense. See Kühner, II. p. 626. What φθερεῖ denotes is the temporal destruction, the punishment of *death* which God will bring upon the destroyer of His temple, as in the LXX. φθείρω is often used of God as inflicting such destruction. Comp. Gen. vi. 13 ; Micah ii. 10 ; 1 Kings ii. 27, *al.* — ἅγιος] as the dwelling of God, sacred therefore from all injury, and not to be destroyed without incurring heavy divine penalty. — οἰτινές ἐστε ὑμεῖς] *of which character* (namely, ἅγιοι) *are ye*. In this we have the minor proposition of the syllogism contained in vv. 16 and 17 : Him who destroys God's temple God will destroy, because the temple is holy ; but ye also are holy, as being the spiritual temple ; consequently, he who destroys you will be destroyed of God. Paul leaves it to his readers themselves to infer, for their own behoof, that in this reasoning of his he means by the destruction of the (ideal) temple the deterioration of the church *on the part of the sectarians*, and by the penal destruction which awaits them, *their ἀπώλεια at the Messianic judgment* (the φθορά of Gal. vi. 8). It is a mistake (with most commentators, including Luther) to regard οἰτινες as put for οἱ (see the passages where this *seems* to be the case in Struve, *Quaest. Herod.* I. p. 2 ff.), and to make it refer to ναὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ : *which temple ye are*. That would rather yield the inappropriate (see on ver. 16) *plural* sense : *cujusmodi templa vos estis*. See Porson and Schaefer, *ad Eurip. Or.* 908. Matthiae, p. 977.

Ver. 18. Μηδεὶς ἐαυτ. ἐξαπ.] Emphatic warning, setting the following exhortation, as directed against an existing evil which arose out of *self-deception*, in that point of view ; comp. vi. 9, xv. 33 ; Gal. vi. 7. Those who were proud of their wisdom did not discern that they were destroying the temple of God with their sectarian proceedings. Theophylact remarks well upon ἐξαπατ.: νομίζων, ὅτι ἄλλως ἔχει τὸ πρᾶγμα καὶ οὐχ ὡς εἶπον. — δοκεῖ] *believes, is of opinion*, not *appears* (Vulgate, Erasmus) ; for it was the *former* that was objectionable and dangerous. Comp. viii. 2, xiv. 37 ; Gal. vi. 3. — σοφὸς εἶναι . . . τούτῳ] ἐν ὑμῖν belongs to σοφὸς εἶναι, and ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι τούτῳ defines the σοφὸς εἶναι ἐν ὑμῖν more precisely, to wit, according to his *non-Christian* standing and condition (comp. ver. 19) : *If any one is persuaded that he is wise among you in this age, i.e. if one claims for himself a being wise in your community, which belongs to the sphere of this pre-Messianic period*. To the αἰὼν οὗτος, despite of all its philosophy and other wisdom falsely so called (i. 20, ii. 6), the true wisdom, which is only in Christ (Col. ii. 3), is in fact a thing foreign and far off ; this αἰὼν is a sphere essentially alien to the true state of being wise in the church ; in it a man may have the λόγος σοφίας

(Col. ii. 23), but not the reality. We must not therefore, in defiance of its place in the sentence, link ἐν τῷ αἰ. τ. *merely* to σόφος (Erasmus, Grotius, Rückert, and many others), in doing which ἐν is often taken as equivalent to κατά. Origen, Cyprian, Chrysostom, Luther, Castalio, Mosheim, Rosenmüller, and others, join it to what follows, rendering either generally to this effect : “is a vulgo hominum pro stulto haberi non recuset ;” or with a more exact development of the meaning, as Hofmann : whoever thinks himself to be wise in the church, “he, just on that account, is not wise, but has yet to become so, and must to this end become a fool in this present age of the world, because his wisdom is a wisdom of this world, and as such is foolishness in the eyes of God.” But the emphasis does not lie upon the contrast between ἐν ὑμῖν and ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι τ., but upon σόφος and μωρός, as is plain from the fact that in the clause expressive of the aim we have the simple σόφος alone without ἐν ὑμῖν. It may be seen, too, from ver. 19 (σοφ. τοῦ κόσμου) that Paul had included ἐν τ. αἰ. τ. in the protasis. — μωρός γενέσθω] *i.e.* let him rid himself of his fancied wisdom, and become (by returning to the pure and simple gospel unalloyed by any sort of philosophy or speculation) such a one as now in relation to that illusory wisdom is a fool. — σοφός] with emphasis : truly wise. See Col. ii. 2, 3. The path of the Christian *sapere aude* proceeds from becoming a fool to wisdom, as from becoming blind to seeing (John ix. 39).

Ver. 19. Giving the ground of the μωρός γενέσθω demanded in order to the γίνεσθαι σόφον. — τοῦ κόσμου τούτου] *i.e.* such as is peculiar to the pre-Messianic world (humanity), like the Hellenic sophistry, rhetoric, etc. ; comp. i. 21, ii. 6. — παρὰ τ. Θεῷ] *judice Deo* ; Rom. ii. 13 ; Winer, p. 369 [E. T. 493]. How truly that wisdom was its own very opposite, and how utterly to be given up ! — γέγρα. γάρ] Job v. 13, not according to the LXX., but expressing the sense of the Hebrew with quite as great fidelity. The passage, however, serves as proof, not for the warning and admonition in ver. 18 (Hofmann),—to take it thus would be arbitrarily to reach back over what immediately precedes the γάρ,—but, as ver. 20 also confirms, for the statement just made, ἡ γὰρ σοφία κ.τ.λ. If, namely, God did not count that wisdom to be folly, then He could not be spoken of as *He who taketh the wise in their craftiness*, *i.e.* who brings it to pass that the wise, while they cunningly pursue their designs, do not attain them, but rather their craftiness turns to their own destruction. Thus the hand of God comes in upon their doings and takes them in their craftiness, whereby He just practically proclaims His judgment regarding their wisdom, that it is *foolishness*. As respects πανουργία, comp. the Hellenic distinction between it and the true wisdom in Plato, *Menex.* p. 247 A : πᾶσά τε ἐπιστήμη χωριζομένη δικαιοσύνης καὶ τῆς ἄλλης ἀρετῆς πανουργία, οὐ σοφία, φαίνεται. — ὁ δρασσόμ. is not “ex Hebr. pro finito δράσσεται” (Pott, following Beza), but the quotation, being taken out of its connection, does not form a complete sentence. Comp. Heb. i. 8 ; Winer, p. 330 [E. T. 443] ; Buttmann, *neut. Gr.* p. 250 [E. T. 291]. — On δράσσεσθαι with the *accusative* (commonly with the *genitive*), comp. Herod. iii. 13, LXX. Lev. v. 12, Num. v. 26.

Ver. 20. Πάλιν] as in Rom. xv. 10 ; Matt. iv. 7. The passage quoted is

Ps. xciv. 11, and the only variation from the Hebrew and the LXX. is in putting σοφῶν instead of ἀνθρώπων, and that purposely, but with no violence to the connection of the original (the reference being to men of pretended wisdom). — μάταιοι] *empty*, thoughts (for *Paul*, at all events, had διαλογ. not σοφ. in view) which are *without true substance*. Comp. Plato, *Soph.* p. 231 B : περὶ τὴν μάταιον δοξοσοφίαν.

Ver. 21. Ὡστε] *Hence*, that is to say, because this world's wisdom, this source of your καυχᾶσθαι ἐν ἀνθρώποις (see ver. 18), is nothing but folly before God, vv. 19, 20. According to Hofmann, ὥστε draws its inference from the whole section, vv. 10–20. But μηδεὶς καυχᾶσθω κ.τ.λ. manifestly corresponds to the warning μηδεὶς ἑαυτ. ἑξαπ. κ.τ.λ. in ver. 18, from the discussion of which (ver. 19 f.) there is now deduced the parallel warning beginning with ὥστε (ver. 21) ; and this again is finally confirmed by a sublime representation of the position held by a Christian (ver. 22 f.). — ἐν ἀνθρώποις] “*id pertinet ad extenuandum*,” Bengel ; the opposite of ἐν Κυρίῳ, i. 31. Human teachers are meant, upon whom the different parties prided themselves against each other (ver. 5, i. 12). Comp. iv. 6. Billroth renders wrongly: *on account of men, whom he has subjected to himself and formed into a sect*. Εἴτε Παῦλος . . . Κηφᾶς in ver. 22 is decisive against this ; for how strangely forced it is to make μηδεὶς refer to the teachers, and ὑμῶν to the church !—The imperative after ὥστε (comp. iv. 5, x. 12 ; Phil. ii. 12) is not governed by that word, but the dependent statement beginning with ὥστε changes to the direct. See Hermann, *ad Viger.* p. 852 ; Bremi, *ad Dem. Phil.* III. p. 276 ; Klotz, *ad Devar.* p. 776. — πάντα γὰρ ὑμῶν ἐστίν] with the emphasis on πάντα: nothing excepted, *all belongs to you* as your property ; so that to boast yourselves of men, consequently, who as party leaders are to be your property to the exclusion of others, is something quite foreign to your high position as Christians. Observe that we are not to explain as if it ran : ὑμῶν γὰρ πάντα ἐστίν (“*illa vestra sunt, non vos illorum*,” Bengel) ; but that the apostle has in view some form of party-confession, as, for example, “Paul is mine,” or “Cephas is my man,” and the like. It was *thus* that some boasted themselves of individual personages as their property, in opposition to the πάντα ὑμ. ἐ. It may be added that what is conveyed in this πάντα ὑμῶν ἐστίν is not “the miraculous nature of the love, which is shed abroad in the hearts of believers by the Spirit, in virtue of which the man embraces the whole world, and enjoys as his own possession whatever in it is beautiful and glorious” (πάντα ?), as is the view of Olshausen ; but rather, in accordance with the diverse character of the objects thereafter enumerated, the twofold idea, that all things are destined in reality to serve the best interests of the Christians (comp. Rom. viii. 28 ff.), and consequently to be in an ethical sense their possession,¹ and that the actual κληρονομία τοῦ κόσμου (Rom. iv. 13 f.) is allotted to them in the Messianic kingdom. Comp. 4 Esdr. ix. 14. The saying of the philosophers : *Omnia sapientis esse*” (see Wetstein), is a lower and imperfect analogue of this Christian idea.

¹ Hence Luther in his gloss rightly infers : “*Therefore no man hath power to make laws over Christians to bind their consciences.*”

Ver. 22. Detailed explication of the πάντα ; then an emphatic repetition of the great thought πάντα ὑμ., in order to link to it ver. 23. — Παῦλος . . . Κηφ.] for they are designed to labour for the furtherance of the Christian weal. Paul does not write ἐγώ ; as forming the subject-matter of a partisan confession, he appears to himself as a third person ; comp. ver. 5. — κόσμος] generally ; for *the world*, although as yet only in an ideal sense, is by destination your possession, inasmuch as, in the coming αἰών, it is to be subjected to believers by virtue of the participation which they shall then obtain in the kingly office of Christ (Rom. iv. 13, viii. 17 ; 1 Cor. vi. 2. Comp. 2 Tim. ii. 12). More specific *verbal* explanations of κόσμος, as it occurs in this full triumphant outpouring—such as *reliqui omnes homines* (Rosenmüller and others), the *unbelieving* world (comp. also Hofmann), and so forth—are totally unwarranted by the connection. Bengel says aptly : “Repentinus hic a Petro ad totum mundum saltus orationem facit amplam cum quadam quasi impatientia enumerandi cetera.” The eye of the apostle thus rises at once from the concrete and empirical to the most general whole, in point of *matter* (κόσμος), *condition* (ζωή, θάνατος), *time* (ἐνεστώτα, μέλλοντα). — ζωή . . . θάνατος] comp. Rom. viii. 38. We are not to refer this, with Chrysostom, Theophylact, and Grotius, to the *teachers* : “si vitam doctoribus protrahit Deus,” and “si ob evangel. mortem obeunt” (Grotius, comp. too, Michaelis), nor to transform it with Pott into : things *living* and *lifeless* ; nor even is the limitation of it to the *readers themselves* (“live ye or die, it is to you for the best,” Flatt) in any way suggested by the text through the analogy of the other points. Both should rather be left without any special reference, life and death being viewed *generally as relations occurring in the world*. Both of them are, like all else, destined to serve for your good in respect of your attainment of salvation. Comp. Phil. i. 21 ; Rom. xiv. 7 ff. ; 1 Cor. xv. 19 ff. Theodoret : καὶ αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ θάνατος τῆς ὑμετέρας ἐνεκεν ὠφελείας ἐπηνέχθη τη φύσει. — εἴτε ἐνεστώτα, εἴτε μέλλοντα] Similarly, we are not to restrict *things existing* (what we find to have already entered on a state of subsistence ; see on Gal. i. 4) and *things to come* to the *fortunes of the readers* (Flatt and many others), but to leave them without more precise definition.

Ver. 23. In ver. 22 Paul had stated the *active* relation of the Christians as regards ownership, all being made to serve them—a relation which, by its universality, must preclude all boasting of human authorities. He now adds to this their *passive* relation as regards ownership also, which is equally adverse to the same hurtful tendency, namely : *but ye belong to Christ*,—so that in this respect, too, the καυχᾶσθαι ἐν ἀνθρώποις of ver. 21 cannot but be unseemly. Rückert would make πάντα γὰρ ὑμῶν ἐστι κ.τ.λ. in ver. 22 the protasis and said by way of concession, so that the leading thought would lie in ver. 23 : “All indeed is yours ; but ye belong to Christ.” We are, he holds, to supply μέν after πάντα. But, even apart from this erroneous addition, there may be urged against his view, partly the fact that an independent emphasis is laid upon the thought πάντα ὑμῶν, as is clear at a glance both from its explication in detail and from the repetition of the phrase ; and partly the internal state of the case, that what Rückert takes as a concession really contains a very pertinent and solid argument against the καυχ.

ἐν ἀνθρώποις. — Χριστὸς δὲ Θεοῦ] and *Christ, again, belongs to God*, is subordinated to God, stands in His service. For κεφαλὴ Χριστοῦ ὁ Θεός, xi. 3. Comp. Luke ix. 20. The strict monotheism of the N. T. (see on Rom. ix. 5), and the relation of Christ as the *Son* to the Father, necessarily give the idea of the *subordination of Christ under God*.¹ As His equality with God and His divine glory before the incarnation (Phil. ii. 6), although *essential*, were still *derived* (εἰκὼν τ. Θεοῦ, πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως, Col. i. 15), so also the divine glory, which He has obtained by His exaltation after His obedience rendered to God even unto the death of the cross, is again a glory *bestowed* upon Him (Phil. ii. 9), and His dominion is destined to be *given back* to God (1 Cor. xv. 28). Since, however, this relation of dependence, affirmed by Χριστὸς δὲ Θεοῦ (comp. on Eph. i. 17), by no means expresses the conception of Arianism, but leaves untouched the essential equality of Christ with God (Theodoret aptly remarks : Χριστὸς γὰρ Θεοῦ οὐχ ὡς κτίσμα Θεοῦ, ἀλλ' ὡς υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ), it was all the more a mistake to assume (so Calvin, Estius, Calovius, and many others, including Flatt and Olshausen) that the statement here refers only to *the human nature*. It is precisely on the *divine* side of His being that Christ is, according to Paul (Rom. i. 4), the *Son* of God, and therefore as γέννημα γνήσιον . . . ὡς αὐτὸν αἷτιον ἔχων κατὰ τὸ πατέρα εἶναι (Chrysostom) not subordinate to Him simply in respect of His manhood. *But for what reason does Paul add here at all this Χριστὸς δὲ Θεοῦ*, seeing it was not needed for the establishment of the prohibition of the *καυχᾶσθαι ἐν ἀνθρώποις* ? We answer : Had he ended with ὑμεῖς δὲ Χριστοῦ, he would then, in appearance, have conceded the claim of the Christ-party, who did *not* boast themselves ἐν ἀνθρώποις (and hence were not touched by ver. 22), but held to *Christ* ; and this, in point of fact, is what Pott and Schott make out that the apostle here does. But this was not his intention ; for the confession of the Christ-party was not, indeed, Ebionitic,—as if the X. δὲ Θεοῦ were aimed *against this* (Oslander),—but, although right enough in *idea*, yet practically objectionable on the ground of the schismatic *misuse* made of it. He rises, therefore, to the *highest absolute* jurisdiction, that to which even *Christ* is subject, in order in this passage, where he rejects the three parties who supported themselves on human authorities, to make the Christ-party, too, feel their error : *Christ, again, is*—not the head of a party, as many among you would make Him, but—*belonging to God*, and consequently exalted in the highest possible degree above all drawing in of His name into party-contentions. In this way, with no little delicacy, Paul sets the relation of the *fourth* Corinthian party also—of which ver. 22 did not allow the mention—in the light of the true Christian perspective ; to do which by no means lay too far from the path of his exhortation (Hofmann), but was very naturally suggested by the concrete circumstances which he could not but have in his eye. (I)

REMARK.—The reference in ver. 22 f. to the party of *Peter* and of *Christ* is to be regarded as simply *by the way*. The whole section from i. 13 to iv. 21 is di-

¹ See also Hahn, *Theol. d. N. T.* I. p. 120 f. Gess, *v. d. Person Chr.* p. 157 ff. Ernesti,

Ursprung der Sünde, I. p. 194 ff. Weiss, *bibl. Theol.* p. 306.

rected against the antagonism between the *Pauline* and the *Apollonian* parties (comp. on ver. 4) ; but the idea πάντα ὑμῶν ἐστίν, which Paul holds up to these two, very naturally leads him to make *all* the parties sensible of their fault as well, although to enter *further* upon the Petrine and the Christ-party did not lie in the line of his purpose. The theory, so much in favour of late, which refers the polemic, beginning with i. 17, to the *Christ-party* (Jaeger, Schenkel, Goldhorn, Kniewel, etc.), has led to acts of great arbitrariness, as is most conspicuous in the case of Kniewel, who divides chap. iii. among all the four parties, giving vv. 3-10 to that of Paul and that of Apollos, vv. 12-17 to that of Peter, and ver. 18 f. to that of Christ ; while in the contrasts of ver. 22 (εἴτε κόσμος . . . μέλλοντα] he finds the Christ-party's doctrine of the harmony of all contrasts accomplished in Christ as the world-soul.

NOTES BY AMERICAN EDITOR.

(H) “*Saved so as by fire.*” Ver. 15.

It may well be doubted whether Meyer's view of this clause is correct. He makes it refer to the grade of salvation which the erring builder is to receive, and he gains this by eliding the force of the adverb of comparison. It is far better to retain the full natural meaning of the words, and explain them as = with difficulty. This is in accordance with the Scriptures quoted by the author. The man will just escape with his life, as one is rescued from a burning building. To this, of course, may be added, as a corollary, that his salvation will be attended with loss, *i.e.* he will occupy a lower place in the kingdom of heaven than he would have done. Notwithstanding that the use of this passage in support of the doctrine of Purgatory has been condemned by the great Roman Catholic commentator, Estius, it is still so applied by the less informed. The violence of such an application is obvious on a moment's reflection. The text does not say that the man is saved by fire as a means of purification, but so as by fire—that is, scarcely or with difficulty. And the fire is not considered as preceding the judgment, but as taking place at the time of the judgment itself, when the Lord Jesus will appear in His glory. “The day” (ver. 13) cannot, according to usage, denote anything else than the day of the coming of the Lord. It is the more important to resist the tenet of purgatorial fire, because it is the legitimate outcome of the Romish doctrine of justification, and rests upon the conviction that, the righteousness that justifies being infused and not imputed, many will be found at death too good to be sent to hell, but not good enough to enter heaven, and hence there requires to be a state and place in which by disciplinary fires their righteousness may be made complete.

(I) *No boasting in men.* Vv. 21-23.

This remarkable passage is an admirable conclusion of the protest against partisan attachment to individual leaders. The church was not made for the teachers, but the teachers for the church. Paul and Apollos and Cephas, however variously gifted and however diverse their spheres or their modes of action, were yet united by being the common property of all believers. Then, as Stanley says, the Apostle proceeds to dilate upon the whole range of God's gifts to His people. He expands the term world to take in not merely mundane

greatness, but the whole created universe, and the utmost contrasts which imagination can suggest, whether in life or in death, in the present or the future. The vast concatenation does not end here. Believers are but part of that golden chain which must be followed up till it unites them to Christ, and even further yet, up to the presence of God Himself. The final touch is worthy of the great Apostle. It represents Christ Himself as subordinate to God, and that, as Meyer justly says, not merely in His human nature, but His divine. The subordination is as to the mode of subsistence and operation, which, however, is entirely consistent with identity of substance and equality in power and glory.

CHAPTER IV.

Ver. 2. $\delta \delta \epsilon$] Lachm. Rück. Tisch. read $\omega \delta \epsilon$, with A B C D* F G $\aleph$, min. Syr. Erp. Aeth. Arm. Vulg. It. Jerome, Aug. Ambr. Pelag. Sedul. Bede. This vastly preponderating testimony in favour of $\omega \delta \epsilon$, and its infrequency with Paul (only again in Col. iv. 9), make the *Recepta* seem the result of change or error on the part of transcribers. — $\zeta \eta \tau \epsilon \iota \tau \alpha \iota$] A C D E F G $\aleph$, min. have $\zeta \eta \tau \epsilon \iota \tau \epsilon$. Recommended by Griesb. But B L and all the vss. and Fathers are against it. A copyist's error. — Ver. 6. Instead of δ , A B C $\aleph$, 31, Syr. p. Copt. Athan. Cyril have α ; which is recommended by Griesb., and adopted by Lachm. Tisch. and Rückert. The Latin authorities have *supra quam*, which leaves their reading doubtful. The preceding $\tau \alpha \upsilon \tau \alpha$ naturally suggested α . — $\phi \rho \nu \epsilon \iota \nu$] is wanting in A B D* E* F G $\aleph$, 46, Vulg. It. and Latin Fathers. Rightly deleted by Lachm. Tisch. and Rückert.¹ A supplementary addition, in place of which Athanasius has $\phi \nu \sigma \iota \omega \sigma \theta \alpha \iota$. — Ver. 9. $\delta \tau \iota$ after $\gamma \acute{\alpha} \rho$ has preponderant evidence against it, and should be deleted, as is done by Lachm. Rück. and Tisch. Superfluous addition. — Ver. 13. $\beta \lambda \alpha \sigma \phi$.] A C $\aleph^*$, 17 46, Clem. Origen (twice), Euseb. Cyril, Damasc. have $\delta \nu \sigma \phi$. Approved by Griesb., accepted by Rück. and Tisch. Rightly; the more familiar (for the verb $\delta \nu \sigma \phi$. occurs nowhere else in the N. T., comp. 2 Cor. vi. 8), and at the same time stronger word was inserted. — Ver. 14. $\nu \nu \theta \epsilon \tau \omega$] A C $\aleph$, min. Theophylact have $\nu \nu \theta \epsilon \tau \omega \nu$ [which is adopted by Westcott & Hort.—C.]. An assimilation to the foregoing participle.

Vv. 1–5. *The right point of view from which to regard Christian teachers* (vv. 1, 2); *Paul, nevertheless, for his own part, does not give heed to human judgment, nay, he does not even judge himself, but his judge is Christ* (vv. 3, 4). *Therefore his readers should give up their passing of judgments till the decision of the Parousia* (ver. 5).

Ver. 1. $\text{o}\tilde{\upsilon}\tau\omega\varsigma$] is commonly taken as *preparatory*, emphatically paving the way for the $\omega\varsigma \text{ }\iota\pi\eta\rho$. which follows. Comp. iii. 15, ix. 26; 2 Cor. ix. 5; Eph. v. 33, *al.*, and often in Greek writers. The $\kappa\alpha\nu\chi$. $\epsilon\nu \text{ }\alpha\nu\theta\rho$. before repudiated arose, namely, out of a false mode of regarding the matter; Paul now states the true mode. Since, however, there is no antithetic particle added here, and since the following epithets: $\text{ }\iota\pi\eta\rho$. $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\upsilon$ and $\omicron\iota\kappa\omicron\nu$. $\theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ sound significantly like the $\text{ }\iota\mu\epsilon\iota\varsigma \delta\epsilon$ $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\upsilon$, $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\varsigma \delta\epsilon$ $\theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ which immediately precede them, $\text{o}\tilde{\upsilon}\tau\omega\varsigma$ is rather to be regarded as the *sic retrospective* (*in this way, in such fashion*), and $\omega\varsigma$ again as stating the objective *qual-*

¹ $\phi\rho\nu\epsilon\iota\nu$ has been defended again by Reiche in his *Commentar. crit.* I. p. 146 ff. He urges that the omission is not attested by the Greek Fathers, and, out of all the versions, only by the Latin ones, and that the word is *indispensable*. But the latter is

not the case; and the former consideration cannot turn the scale against the decisive weight of the chief codices, among which only C—and even that not certainly—has $\phi\rho\nu\epsilon\iota\nu$.

ity, in which the ἡμεῖς have a claim to the οὕτως ἡμᾶς λογιζ. ἄνθρ. which is enjoined. Accordingly, we should explain as follows : *Under this point of view*, as indicated already in ver. 22 f. (namely, that all is yours ; but that ye are Christ's ; and that Christ, again, is God's), *let men form their judgment of us, as of those who are servants of Christ and stewards of divine mysteries*. Let us but be judged of as servants of Christ, etc., according to the standard of that lofty Christian mode of view (οὕτως) and how conclusively shut out from this sphere of vision will be the partisan *καυχᾶσθαι ἐν ἀνθρώποις* ! Men will be lifted high above that. — ἡμᾶς] *i.e.* myself and such as I, by which other apostles also and apostolic teachers (like Apollos) are meant. In view of iii. 22, no narrower limitation is allowable. — ἄνθρωπος] not a *Hebraism* (ὧς, *one* ; so most interpreters, among whom Luther, Grotius, and others explain it wrongly *every one*), but in accordance with a pure *Greek* use of the word in the sense of the indefinite *one* or *a man* (Plato, *Protag.* p. 355 A, *Gorg.* p. 500 C, *al.*). So also in xi. 28, Gal. vi. 1. Bengel's "*homo quivis nostris similis*" is an importation. — ὑπηρ. X. κ. οἶκον. μυστ. Θεοῦ] They are servants of Christ, and, as such, are at the same time stewards of God (the supreme ruler, iii. 23, the Father and Head of the theocracy, the οἶκος Θεοῦ, 1 Tim. iii. 15), inasmuch as they are entrusted with His *secrets*, *i.e.* entrusted and commissioned to communicate by the preaching of the gospel the divine decrees for the redemption of men and their receiving Messianic blessings (see on Rom. xi. 25, xvi. 25 ; Eph. i. 9 ; Matt. xiii. 11),—decrees in themselves unknown to men, but fulfilled in Christ, and unveiled by means of revelation. They are to do this just as the steward of a household (see on Luke xvi. 1) has to administer his master's goods. Comp. as regards this idea, ix. 17 ; 1 Tim. i. 4 ; Titus i. 7 ; 1 Pet. iv. 10. There is no reference whatever here to the *sacraments*, which Olshausen and Osiander again desire to include. See i. 17. The whole notion of a *sacrament*, as such, was generalized at a later date from the actions to which men restricted it, sometimes in a wider, sometimes in a narrower sense. — Observe, moreover : between the *Father*, the *Master* of the house, and the οἰκονόμοι there stands the *Son*, and He has from the Father the power of disposal (comp. on John viii. 35 f. ; 1 Cor. xv. 25 ff.), so that the οἰκονόμοι are His *servants*. Paul uses ὑπηρέτης only in this passage ; but there is no ground for importing any special design into the word (such as that it is *humbler* than διάκονος). Comp. on Eph. iii. 7.

Ver. 2. If we read ὥδε (see the critical remarks), we must understand the verse thus : *Such being the state of the case, it is, for the rest, required of the stewards*, etc., so that λοιπόν (i. 16) would express something which, in connection with the relationship designed in ver. 1, remained now alone to be mentioned as pertaining thereto, while ὥδε¹ again, quite in accordance with the old classical usage (see Lehrs, *Arist.* p. 84 ff.), would convey the notion of *sic*, *i.e.* "*cum eo statu res nostrae sint*" (Ellendt, *Lex. Soph.* II. p. 991). We might paraphrase, therefore, as follows : "*Such being the nature of our po-*

¹ The word would be singularly superfluous, and would drag behind in the most awkward way, were we, with Lachmann,

to treat it as belonging to ver. 1; and to separate it by a point from λοιπόν.

sition as servants, the demand to be made upon the stewards of households¹ of course takes effect." If we abide by the *Recepta*, ὁ δὲ λοιπὸν must be rendered : *But as to what remains, i.e.* but as respects what else there is which has its place in connection with the relationship of service spoken of in ver. 1, this is the demand, etc.; comp. on Rom. vi. 10. It is a perversion of the passage to make it refer, as Billroth does, to the preceding depreciation of the supposed merits of the teachers : "*but what still remains for them is, that they can at least strive for the praise of faithfulness.*" The rest of the verse says nothing at all about a being able to strive ; for ζητεῖται ἐν means nothing else but : *it is sought at their hand (requiritur), i.e. demanded of them.* See Wetstein. Hofmann's interpretation, too, is an impossible one. He makes ὁ δὲ λοιπὸν down to εὐρεθῇ to be the *protasis* ; ἐμοὶ δὲ κ.τ.λ., and that running on as far as κύριός ἐστιν in ver. 4, to be the *apodosis* : As respects that, however, which . . . is further required, namely, that one be found faithful, it is to me, etc. This interpretation gives us, instead of the simple, clearly progressive sentences of the apostle, a long, obscurely and clumsily involved period, against which on linguistic grounds there are the two considerations—(1) that ὁ δὲ λοιπὸν ζητεῖται would presuppose some demand already conveyed in ver. 1, to which a new one was now added ; and (2) that the δέ of the *apodosis* in ver. 3 would require to find its antithetic reference in the alleged *protasis* in ver. 2 (comp. Acts xi. 17 ; Baeumlein, *Partik.* p. 92 f.), namely, to this effect : *to me, on the contrary, not concerned about this required faithfulness, it is, etc.* Now the first is not the case, and the second would be absurd. Neither the one difficulty nor the other is removed by the arbitrarily inserted thoughts, which Hofmann seeks to read between the lines.² — *ἵνα*] is sought *with the design, that there be found.* Hence the *object of the seeking* is conveyed in the form expressive of *design*. That εὐρίσκεσθαι is not equivalent to εἶναι (Wolff, Flatt, Pott, and others) is plain here, especially from the correlation in which it stands to ζητεῖται. — *τις*] i.e. *any one of them.* See Matthiae, p. 1079 ; Nägelsbach on the *Iliad*, p. 299, ed. 3. — *πιστός*] Luke xii. 42, xvi. 10 ff. ; Matt. xxv. 21 ff. ; Eph. vi. 21, *al.* The *summing up* of the *duties* of spiritual service.

Ver. 3. I, for my part, however, feel myself in no way made dependent on your judgment by this ζητεῖται κ.τ.λ. — εἰς ἐλάχιστόν ἐστιν] *εἰς*, in the sense of giving the result : *it comes to something utterly insignificant*, evinces itself as in the highest degree unimportant. Comp. Pindar, *Ol.* i. 122 : ἐς χάριν τέλλεται, Plato, *Alc.* I. p. 126 A ; Buttmann, *neutest. Gramm.* p. 131 [E. T. 150]. — *ἵνα*] does not stand for ὅταν (Pott), nor does it take the place of the construction with the infinitive (so *most* interpreters) ; but the conception of *design*, which is *essential* to *ἵνα*, is in the mind of the writer, and has

¹ This ἐν τοῖς οἰκονόμ. is not "uncalled for and superfluous" after ὡδε (as Hofmann objects) ; for Paul had, in ver. 1, described the official service of the teachers by *two* designations, but now desires to attach what more he has to say in ver. 2 specially to the *second* of these designations, and hence he has again to bring in the οἰκονόμοι.

² In λοιπὸν he finds : "Besides this, that the stewards act in accordance with their name." By the antithetic ἐμοὶ δέ, again, Paul means : "in contrast to those who conduct themselves as though he must consider it of importance to him." By interpolations of this sort, everything may be moulded into *what shape one will*.

given birth to the expression. The thought is : I have an exceedingly slight interest in the design of receiving your judgment. — ἀνακριθῶ] “*fidelisne sim nec ne*,” Bengel. — ἡ ὑπὸ ἀνθρ. ἡμ.] *or by a human day* at all. The *day*, i.e. the *day of judgment*, on which a human sentence is to go forth upon me, is personified. It forms a contrast with the ἡμέρα Κυρίου, which Paul proceeds hereafter, not indeed to *name*, but to *describe*, see ver. 5. — ἀλλ’ οὐδέ] *yea, not even*, as in iii. 2. — ἐμαυτόν] Billroth and Rückert think that the contrast between the persons properly demanded αὐτὸς ἐμαυτ. here, which, however, has been overlooked by Paul. But the *active* expression ἐμαυτόν ἀνακρίνω is surely the complete contrast to the *passive* ὑφ’ ὑμ. ἀνακρ.; hence αὐτός *might*, indeed, have been added to strengthen the statement, but there was no *necessity* for its being so.—The ἀνακρίνειν in the whole verse is neither to be understood solely of unfavourable, nor solely of favourable judging, but of *any sort of judging regarding one’s worth* in general. See vv. 4, 5.

Ver. 4. Parenthetical statement of the ground of Paul’s not even judging himself (οὐδὲν . . . δεδικ.), and then the antithesis (δέ : *but indeed*) to the above οὐδὲ ἐμαυτ. ἀνακρίνω. — γάρ] The element of *proof* lies neither in the first clause alone (Hofmann), nor in the second clause alone, so that the first would be merely concessive (Baumgarten, Winer, Billroth, Rückert, * who supplies μέν here again, de Wette, Osiander), but in the antithetic *relation of both clauses*, wherein ἀλλά has the force of *at*, not of “*sondern* :” I judge not my own self, *because I am conscious to myself of nothing, but am not thereby justified*, i.e. *because my pure* (official, see ver. 2) *self-consciousness* (comp. Acts xxiii. 1, xxiv. 16 ; 2 Cor. i. 12) *is still not the ground on which my justification rests*. As regards the expression, comp. Plato, *Apol.* p. 21 B : οὔτε μέγα οὔτε μικρὸν ξύνοιδα ἐμαυτῷ σοφὸς ὢν, *Rep.* p. 331 A ; and Horace, *Ep.* i. 1. 61 : “*nil conscire sibi, nulla pallescere culpa* ;” Job xxvii. 6. — οὐκ ἐν τούτῳ δεδικ.] is *ordinarily* understood wrongly : “*I do not on that account look upon myself as guiltless*.” For the words οὐκ ἐν τούτῳ, negating justification by a good conscience, make it clear that δεδικ. expresses the customary conception of *being justified by faith* (see on Rom. i. 17 ; so rightly, Calovius, Billroth, Rückert), since, on the view just referred to, we must have had ἐν τούτῳ οὐ.¹ The οὐ is as little in its wrong place here as in xv. 51. Note that the δεδικαίωμαι is to the apostle an undoubted *certain fact* ;² hence

¹ Paul’s thought has run thus :—“ Were I justified by my conscience free of reproach, then I should be entitled to pass judgment on myself, namely, just in accordance with the standard of the said conscience. But seeing that I am *not* justified by this conscience (but by Christ), it cannot even serve me as a standard for self-judgment, and I must refrain therefrom, and leave the judgment regarding me to Christ.” This applies also against de Wette, who holds our exposition to be contrary to the context, because what follows is not ὁ δὲ δικαίωσιν, but ὁ δὲ ἀνακρίνων. Moreover, the further imputation of moral desert is certainly not done away with by justification, but it remains in force

until the judgment. Δεδικαίωμαι, however, does not refer to the being found righteous at the day of judgment (against Lipsius, *Rechtfertigungsl.* p. 48), but, as the perfect shows, to the righteousness *obtained* by faith, which to the consciousness of the apostle was at all times a present blessing.—Observe, further, how alien to Paul was the conception that the conscience is the expression of the real *divine* life in the man. Comp. Delitzsch, *Psychol.* p. 141.

² So precisely Ignatius, *ad Rom.* 5 : ἀλλ’ οὐ παρὰ τοῦτο δεδικαίωμαι. The *certitudo gratiae* is expressed but as *not based upon the conscience void of reproach*.

we may not explain it, with Hofmann : Not thereby am I pronounced righteous as respects faithfulness in the fulfilment of my office, but only if (?) the Lord shall charge me with no neglect of duty. That would plainly make the *δεδικαίωμαι* *problematic*.¹ — Κύριος] Christ, ver. 5.

Ver. 5. *Therefore judge nothing before the time, namely, with respect to me ; not as Billroth thinks : one sect regarding another, which is inadmissible in view of the preceding ἀνακρ. με and of the whole passage, vv. 3, 4, which all applies to Paul. The process of thought from ver. 3 onwards is, namely, this : “ For my part, you may judge me if you will, I make very little of that ; but (ver. 4) seeing that I do not even judge myself, but that he that judgeth me is Christ, I therefore counsel you (ver. 5) not to pass a judgment upon me prematurely.”* — πρὸ καιροῦ] i.e. *before it is the right time*, Matt. viii. 29 ; Eccles. xxx. 24, li. 30 ; Lucian, *Jov. Trag.* 47. How long such judging would continue to be πρὸ καιροῦ, we learn only from what comes after ; hence we must not by anticipation assign to καιρός the specific sense of *tempus reditus Christi*. — τι] i.e. κρίσιν τινά, John vii. 24. — κρίνετε] describes the *passing of the judgment*, the consequence of the ἀνακρ., in a manner accordant with the looking forward to the Messianic *judgment*. Luther, Raphel, and Wolf render: *alium alii praeferre* ; but this runs counter to the context, for it must be analogous to the general ἀνακρ. ἕως ἂν ἔλθῃ ὁ κ.] Epexegetis of πρὸ καιροῦ : judge not before the time (judge not, I say), *until the Lord shall have come*. Then only is it a *καίριον κρίνειν*, because then only can the judgment be pronounced rightly according to the Lord's decision. The ἂν marks out the coming as *in so far problematical* (depending upon circumstances ; see Hartung, *Partikell.* p. 291), inasmuch as it was not, indeed, doubted, and yet at the same time not dependent upon subjective determination, but an object of expectant faith in the unknown future. Comp. Matt. xvi. 28 ; Mark ix. 1 ; Luke ix. 27, xiii. 35 ; Rev. ii. 25. — ὅς καί] καί is the *also* customary with the relative, the effect of which is to bring into prominence some element in keeping with what has gone before (Baeumlein, *Partik.* p. 152 ; Buttmann, *neut. Gr.* p. 243 [E. T. 283]). In His function as Judge, in which He is to come, He will do *this also*, He will light up, i.e. make manifest, what is hidden in the darkness. Respecting φωτίσει, comp. Eccles. xxiv. 32 ; 2 Tim. i. 10 ; Plut. *Mor.* p. 931 C, and the passages in Wetstein. What *withdraws* itself from the light as its *opposite* (Hofmann, who takes καὶ . . . καί as meaning *as well, as also*) is *included* here, but not that alone. Compare rather the general statement in Luke viii. 17. — καὶ φανερ. τ. βουλ. τῶν καρδ.] a special element selected from the foregoing general affirmation. The *significant* bearing of what Paul here affirms of Christ at His coming is the application which the readers were to make of it to himself and the other teachers ; it was to be understood, namely, that their true character also would only then become manifest, i.e. be laid open as an object of knowledge, but now was not yet submitted to judgment. — καὶ τότε . . . Θεοῦ] so that ye can only then pass judgment on your teachers

¹ [Most critics agree that there is here no reference to the doctrine of justification, and that all the Apostle means is that the

question of his fidelity was one not to be decided by his conscience, but by the Lord. —T. W. C.]

with sure (divine) warrant for what ye do. The chief emphasis is upon the ἀπὸ τ. Θεοῦ, which is for that reason put at the end (Kühner, II. p. 625), and next to it upon what is placed first, ὁ ἔπαινος. This does not mean *praemium* (so Flatt, with older expositors, citing wrongly in support of it such passages as Rom. ii. 29, xiii. 3 ; 1 Pet. i. 7, ii. 14 ; Wisd. xv. 19 ; Polybius, ii. 58. 11), nor is it a *vox media* (as, following Casaubon, *ad Epict.* 67, Wolf, Rosenmüller, Pott, and others assume wholly without proof) ; but it denotes simply *the praise, the commendation*. The apparent incongruity with ἐκάστῳ is obviated by the article : *the praise that appertains to him* (Bernhardy, p. 315) shall be given to each,—so that Paul here *puts entirely out of sight* those who deserve *no* praise at all. And rightly so. For his readers were to apply this to *him* and *Apollos* ; hence, as Calvin justly remarks : “haec vox ex bonae conscientiae fiducia nascitur.” See ver. 4. Theophylact’s view, although adopted by many, is an arbitrary one : “unde et contrarium datur intelligi, sed mavult εὐφημεῖν,” Grotius (so also Bengel, Billroth, Rückert, Olshausen). — ἀπὸ τ. Θεοῦ] not from *men*, as *ye* now place and praise the one above the other, but *on the part on God* ; for Christ the Judge is God’s vicegerent and representative, John v. 27 ff. ; Acts x. 42, xvii. 31 ; Rom. ii. 16, *al.*

Vv. 6–13. *Now, what I have hitherto given utterance to in a manner applicable to myself and Apollos, has for its object to wean you from party-pride* (ver. 6). *Rebuke of this pride* (vv. 7–13).

Ver. 6. Δέ] pursuing the subject ; the apostle turns now to the *final remonstrances and rebukes* which he has to give in reference to the party-division among them ; in doing so, he addresses his *readers generally* (not the teachers) as ἀδελφοί with a winning warmth of feeling, as in i. 11. — ταῦτα] from iii. 5 onwards, where he brings in himself and Apollos specially and by name, assigning to both their true position and its limits to be observed by them with all humility, and then appending to this the further instructions which he gives up to iv. 5. Ταῦτα is not to be made to refer back to i. 12, where Paul and Apollos are not named *alone* (so Baur, following older expositors). — μετεσχημ. εἰς ἑμavτ. κ. Ἀπολλῶ] *I have changed the form of it into myself and Apollos, i.e.* I have, instead of directing my discourse to *others*, upon whom it might properly have been moulded, written in such fashion *in an altered form*, that what has been said applies now *to myself and Apollos*. It is on account of the contrast with *others* which floats before the apostle’s mind, that he writes not simply εἰς ἐμέ, but εἰς ἑμavτόν ; εἰς, again, denotes the *reference* of this change of form to the parties concerned. Respecting μετασχηματίζειν, *to transform*, comp. 2 Cor. xi. 14, Phil. iii. 21 ; Symm. 1 Sam. xxviii. 8 ; 4 Macc. ix. 21 ; Plato, *Legg.* x. p. 903 E, 906 C (ῥῆμα μετασχηματισμένον) ; Lucian, *Imag.* 9, *Halc.* 5 ; Heliodorus, ii. p. 93. The σχῆμα, to which the word here refers, is the form in which the foregoing statements have been presented, which has been other than the concrete state of the case at Corinth would properly have involved ; for he has so moulded it as to make that bear upon himself and Apollos, which more properly should have applied to *others*. *Now, who are those others?* Not the *order of teachers generally* (Calovius, Billroth, de Wette, Neander,

et al., also my own former view), for in that case we should have no *change of form*, but only a *specializing*; but rather: the *instigators of parties in Corinth*, with their self-exaltation and jealousy, as is clear from the following clause stating the design in view, and from ver. 7 ff. It was *they* who split up the church and infected it with their own evil qualities. But from *Paul and Apollos* the readers were to learn to give up all such conduct, —from *those very men*, who had respectively founded and built up the church, but who by these partisans had been stamped with the character of heads of sects and so misused, to the grievous hurt of the Christian community. Baur's explanation is contrary to the notion of μετεσχημ., but in favour of his own theory about the Christ-party: what has been said of me and Apollos holds *also of the other parties*; this not applying, however, to τοὺς τοῦ Χριστοῦ, who are to be regarded as forming a peculiar party by themselves. Lastly, it is also a mistake (see Introd. § 1) to interpret it with Chrysostom, Erasmus, Beza, Vatablus, Cornelius à Lapide, and others: "I have put our names as *fictitious* in place of those of the *actual* leaders of parties;"¹ or to hold, with Pareus and Mosheim, that μετασχη. refers to the homely *figures* which Paul has used of himself and Apollos (gardeners, husbandmen, builders, house-stewards), from which the readers were to learn humility. These figures were surely lofty enough, since they represented the teachers as Θεοῦ συνεργούς! Moreover, the figures in themselves plainly could not teach the Corinthians humility; the lesson must lie in the intrinsic tenor of the ideas conveyed. — Ἀπολλῶ] the same form of the accusative as in Acts xix. 1. A B 8* have Ἀπολλών. See regarding both forms, Buttmann's *ausf. Gr.* I. p. 207 f.; Kühner, § 124, ed. 2. — δι' ὑμᾶς] not in any way for our own sakes. — ἵνα ἐν ἡμῖν κ.τ.λ.] more precise explanation of the δι' ὑμᾶς ("instructionis vestrae causa," Estius): *in order that ye might learn by us* (Winer, p. 361 [E. T. 483]), that is to say, by having us before you as an example of shunning undue self-exaltation, in accordance with what I have stated regarding our official position, duty, responsibility, etc. — τὸ μὴ ὑπὲρ ὃ γέγραπ. The elliptical: "*not above what is written*," is made to rank as a substantive by the τό (Matthiae, § 280); for φρονεῖν is spurious (see the critical remarks). The suppression of the verb after μή in lively discourse is common in the classics. See Hartung, *Partikell.* II. p. 153; Kühner, II. p. 607; Klotz, *ad Devar.* p. 607. The short, terse μὴ ὑπὲρ ὃ γέγραπ. may have been an old and familiar saying of the Rabbins (Ewald); only Paul never quotes such elsewhere. — ὃ γέγραπ. is by Luther and most expositors (including Storr, Rosenmüller, Flatt, Heydenreich, Pott, Billroth, Neander) made to refer to *what Paul has written in the preceding section*. But Grotius hits the truth in the matter when he says: γέγραπται in his libris *semper* ad libros V. T. refertur. Only Grotius should not have referred it to a single passage (Deut. xvii. 20; comp. also Olshausen) which the readers could not be expected to divine. It denotes generally *the rule*

¹ Michaelis: "I know quite well that no sect among you calls itself after myself or Apollos . . . ; the true names I rather refrain from giving, in order to avoid of-

fence," etc. But, as Calovius justly observes, the μετασχηματισμός is here not "*per fictionis*, sed *per figurationis* modum."

written in the O. T., which is not to be transgressed ; and this means here, according to the context, *the rule of humility and modesty*, within the bounds of which a man will not be vainly puffed up, nor will presume to claim anything that lies beyond the limits of the ethical canon of the Scriptures. Comp. Rückert, Reiche, Ewald. And Paul could the more readily express himself in this *general* way, inasmuch as all the quotations hitherto made by him from the O. T. (i. 19, 31, iii. 19) exhorted to humility. It is against the context to suppose, with Cajetan and Beza, that the reference is to the *dogmatic* standard of the O. T., which was not to be transcended by pretended wisdom. Chrysostom, Theodoret, and Theophylact went so far as to refer it to *sayings of Christ* (such as Mark x. 44 ; Matt. vii. 1 ; Theodoret even adds to these (1 Cor. vii. 24), which neither Paul nor his readers could think of in connection with the habitually used γέγρα.—Without having the slightest support in the use and wont of the language (for in passages like Pindar, *Nem.* vi. 13, Eur. *Ion.* 446 [455], γράφειν has just the ordinary force of *to write*), and wholly in the face of the N. T. usage of γέγραπται, Hofmann brings in here the general notion of the *definite measure* which is *ascribed*, adjusted to each by God (Rom. xii. 3). Nor is any countenance lent to this interpretation by γράμμα in Thuc. v. 29. 4 ; for that means a written clause (see Krüger). What Paul means is the objective *sacred rule of the Scriptures*, the presumptuous disregard of which was the source of the mischief at Corinth ; “*ulcus aperit*,” Beza. — ἵνα μὴ εἰς ὑπὲρ κ.τ.λ.] *For one another against the other*, is a telling description of the partisan procedure ! The members of a party plumed themselves to such an extent on their own advantages, that one did so in behalf of the other (ὑπὲρ, comp. 2 Cor. ix. 2), seeking thereby mutually among themselves to maintain and exalt their own reputation (εἰς ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἑνός), and that with hostile tendency towards the third person, who belonged to another party (κατὰ τοῦ ἑτέρου). Olshausen understands ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἑνός of their *outbidding each other in pretensions*, which, however, would require the accusative with ὑπὲρ ; and Winer, p. 358 [E. T. 478], renders : “*so that he deems himself exalted above the other* ;” against which—apart from the fact that ὑπὲρ with the genitive does not occur in this sense in the N. T. (see, moreover, Matthiae, p. 1360)—the immediate context is conclusive, according to which it is he only who is despised by the φησιοῦμενος, who can be the ἕτερος (the *different* one) ; and just as εἰς stands in *antithetic* correlation with τοῦ ἑτέρου, so ὑπὲρ also does with κατὰ ; comp. Rom. viii. 31 ; Mark ix. 40. The *ordinary* interpretation is : “*On account of the teacher, whom he has chosen to be his head*,” Rückert ; comp. Reiche, Ewald, Hofmann. But like εἰς, so ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἑνός also must refer to the collective subject of φησιοῦσθε, and consequently both of them together convey the same sense as ὑπὲρ ἀλλήλων, only in a more concrete way. Comp. 1 Thess. v. 11 ; Susann. 52 ; Ecclus. xlii. 24 f. ; 1 Macc. xiii. 28 ; often, too, in Greek writers. — The φησιοῦσθαι of a εἰς ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἑνός takes place κατὰ τοῦ ἑτέρου in the jealous wranglings of mutually opposing parties *reciprocally*, so that each has always full room for the κατὰ τοῦ ἑτέρου (against Hofmann’s objection). — φησιοῦσθε] the *present indicative* after ἵνα occurs only here and in Gal. iv. 17. The instances of it, wont to be ad-

duced from classical writers, have been long since given up. See Hermann, *ad Viger.* p. 851 f. ; Schneider, *ad Xen. Ath.* i. 11. The passages, again, in Kypke and Valckenaer, where *iva* is found with the *past* indicative, were wholly inapplicable here. Comp. on Gal. iv. 17, note ; Stallbaum, *ad Plat. Symp.* p. 181 E. On these grounds Billroth and Rückert assume that Paul had meant to form the subjunctive, but had formed it wrongly ; so too, before them, Bengel characterized the form as a “singularis ratio contractionis ;” and Reiche also, in his *Comment. crit.* I. p. 152, satisfies himself with the notion of an erroneously formed contraction. As if we were warranted in taking for granted that the most fluent in language of the apostles could not be safely trusted with forming the mood of a verb in *ow* ! Winer finds here an improper usage of the later Greek.¹ But, apart from the absence of all proof for this usage in the apostolic age (it can only be proved in much later writings, as also in modern Greek ; see Winer, p. 272 [E. T. 362]), had Paul adopted it, he would have brought it in oftener, and not have written correctly in *every* other case ;² least of all, too, would he have put the *indicative* here, when he had just used the correct *subjunctive* immediately before it (*μάθητε*). Fritzsche (*ad Matth.* p. 836) took *iva* as *ubi*, and explained : “*ubi* (i.e. *qua conditione*, *quando demisse de vobis statuere nostro exemplo didiceritis*) *minime alter in alterius detrimentum extollitur.*” At a later date (in *Fritzschorum opusc.* p. 186 ff.) he wished to resort to *emendation*, namely : *iva* ἐν ἡμῖν μάθητε τὸ μὴ ὑπὲρ ὃ γέγραπται φρονεῖν, ἔνα μὴ ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἐν ὃς φυσιουῖσθαι κατὰ τοῦ ἐτέρου (so, too, very nearly Theodoret). But although it might easily enough have happened that *iva μή* should be written by mistake in place of *ἐνα μή*, the consequence of that mistake would in that case necessarily have been the alteration of *φυσιουῖσθαι*,³ not into *φυσιουῖσθε*, but into *φυσιῶσθε*, and the *subjunctive*, not the *indicative*, must therefore have had the preponderance of critical evidence in its favour (but it is found, in point of fact, only in 44, Chrys. ms.). The only explanation of *iva* which is in accordance with the laws of the language, and therefore the only admissible one, is that given by Fritzsche, *ad Matth. l.c.* ; *iva* cannot be the particle of *design*, because it is followed by the *indicative* ; it *must*, on the contrary, be the *local* particle, *where*, and that in the sense of *whereby*, *under which relation*, so that it expresses the *position of the case* (Homer, *Od.* vi. 27 ; Plato, *Gorg.* p. 484 E ; Sophocles, *Oed. Col.* 627, 1239 ; Eur. *Hec.* ii. 102, 711, Andoc. vi. 9, *al.* ;

¹ So, too, Wieseler on *Gal.* p. 378 ; Hofmann on *Gal.* p. 138. Barnab. 7 : *iva* . . . δεῖ, is an earlier example than any adduced by Winer and Wieseler. But how easily δεῖ might have been written here by mistake for δῆ, which is so similar in sound ! (comp. Dressel, p. 17). Should δεῖ, however, be the original reading, then *iva* may just as well be *ubi*, as in our passage. The readings ἀδετε and μετέχετε in Ignatius, *ad Eph.* 4, are dubious (Dressel, p. 124).—Buttmann's conjecture (*neut. Gr.* p. 202 [E. T. 235]), that the contracted presents, on account of the final syllable having the circumflex, repre-

sent the futures, is totally destitute of proof.

² 1 Thess. iv. 13 included (against Tischendorf).—In Col. iv. 17, πληροῖς is subjunctive.—As respects Lachmann's erroneous reading, 2 Pet. i. 10, Wieseler, p. 379, is right.—In John xvii. 3, Gal. vi. 12, Tit. ii. 4, Rom. xiii. 17, the indicative readings are to be rejected (in opposition to Tischendorf).

³ The *ss*, too, has φυσιουσθαι. But how often does that codex interchange αι and ε ! Immediately before it has γεγραπτε instead of γεγραπται.

also Schaefer, *ad Soph. O. C.* 621 ; and Baeumlein, *Partik.* p. 143 f.). What Paul says then is this : in order that ye may learn the *ne ultra quod scriptum est, whereby* (i.e. *in the observance of which rule*) ye then (*φυσιοῦσθε* is the future realized as present) *do not puff up yourselves*, etc. Suitable though it would be, and in accordance with the apostle's style (Rom. vii. 13 ; Gal. iii. 14, iv. 5 ; 2 Cor. ix. 3), that a second telic *ἵνα* should follow upon the first, still the linguistic impossibility here must turn the scale against it. To put down the indicative to the account of the transcribers has against it the almost unanimous agreement of the critical evidence in excluding the subjunctive (which would be inexplicable, on the supposition of the indicative not being the original). Again, to trace it back to the origin of the Epistle by assuming that Paul made a slip in dictating, or his amanuensis in taking down his words, is all the more unwarranted, seeing that the self-same phenomenon recurs in Gal. iv. 17, while the clause here, as it stands, *admits of a rendering which gives a good sense and is grammatically correct.*¹ — The subjective form of the negation *μή*, in the relative clause, has arisen from the *design* cherished by Paul, and floating before his mind. Comp. *e.g.* Sophocles, *Trach.* 797 : μέθεες ἑνταῦθ' ὅπου με μή τις ὄψεται βροτῶν ; and see Baeumlein, *ut supra*, p. 290 ; Winer, p. 447 [E. T. 603].

Ver. 7. The words *ἵνα μή . . . ἑτέρον* are now justified by two considerations—(1) *No one maketh thee to differ* ; it is an imaginary difference of thine own making, which thou settest between thee and others. (2) *What thou possessest thou hast not from thyself, and it is absurd to boast thyself of it as though it were thine own work.* Hofmann holds that Paul in his first proposition glances at his *own* difference from others, and in his second at the gifts of *Apollos* ; but this is neither indicated in the text, nor would it accord with the fact that he and Apollos are to be examples of *humility* to the readers, but not examples to *humble* them—namely, by high position and gifts. —σέ] applies to each individual of the preceding *ὑμεῖς*, not therefore simply to the sectarian *teachers* (Pott, following Chrysostom and several of the old expositors). — The literal sense of *διακρίνει* is to be retained. The Vulgate rightly renders : “*Quis enim te discernit?*” Comp. Acts xv. 9 ; Homer, *Od.* iv. 179 ; Plato, *Soph.* p. 253 E, *Charm.* p. 171 C. This of course refers, *in point of fact*, to supposed *pre-eminence* ; but Paul will not *describe* it as *pre-eminence* (contrary to the common rendering : *Who maketh thee to differ for the better?*). — τὶ δὲ ἔχεις κ.τ.λ.] *δέ*, like that which follows, heaps question on question. See Hartung, *Partikell.* I. p. 169. To what Paul is pointing in the general : “*But what possessest thou,*” etc., their own conscience told his readers, and it is clear also from the next question, *that*, namely, *of which they boasted*, their Christian insight, wisdom, eloquence, and the like. He certainly did not think of himself and the other teachers as the *source* (ἐλαβεῖς) *of the gifts* (Semler, Heydenreich, Pott), which would be quite contrary to his humble piety, but : οὐδὲν οἰκοθεν ἔχεις, ἀλλὰ παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ λαβὼν, Chrysostom. Comp. iii. 5, xii. 6, xv. 10. — εἰ δὲ καὶ ἔλ.]

¹ [Still it is better with most critics to take the particle as a conjunction and consider the phrase a solecism, which Bishop Light-

foot says is not unusual in the later writers. —T. W. C.]

again, even if thou hast received, even if thou hast been endowed with gifts, which I will by no means deny. *Εἰ καὶ* is not meant to represent the possession of them as problematical (Rückert), but is concessive. Comp. 2 Cor. iv. 3. See Hermann, *ad Viger.* p. 832 ; comp. Hartung, I. p. 140 f. ; Klotz, *ad Devar.* p. 519 f. — τί κανχᾶσαι κ.τ.λ.] οὐδεὶς ἐπ' ἄλλοτρίαις παρακαταθή- καις μεγαφρονεῖ, ἐπαγρυπνεῖ δὲ ταύταις, ἵνα φυλάξῃ τῷ δεδοκότι, Theodoret.

Ver. 8. The discourse, already in ver. 7 roused to a lively pitch, becomes now bitterly ironical, heaping stroke on stroke, even as the proud Corinthians, with their partisan conduct, needed a *νουθεσία* (ver. 14) to teach them humility. The transition, too, from the individualizing singular to the *plural* corresponds to the rising emotion. The *interrogative* way of taking the passage (Baumgarten) weakens it without reason ; for the disapproval of such bitter derision (Stolz, Rückert) is, in the first place, over-hasty, since Paul could not but know best how he had to chastise the Corinthians ; and, in the second, it fails to recognize the fact, that he, just in consequence of the purity of his conscience, could give rein to the indignant temper amply warranted in him by the actual position of things, without justifying the suspicion of self-seeking and thirst for power (this in opposition to Rückert). — In *κεκορ. ἐστέ, ἐπλουτ., and ἐβασιλ.,* we have a vehement climax : *Already sated are ye, already become rich are ye ; without our help ye have attained to dominion !* The sarcastic force of this address, which shows the repulsive shape in which the inflated character and demeanour of the Corinthians presented itself, is intensified by the emphatically prefixed ἤδη . . . ἤδη and χωρὶς ἡμῶν : “ *already* ye have, what was expected only in the coming αἰών, fulness of satisfaction and of enrichment in Messianic blessings ; *without our help* (mine and that of Apollos, ver. 6) are ye arrived at the highest stage of Messianic power and glory, at the βασιλεία !” You have already reached such a pitch of Christian perfection, are become without us such mightily exalted and dominant personages, and there is presented in you an anticipation of the future Messianic satisfaction, of the Messianic fulness of possession and dominion. Ordinarily, *κεκορ.* and *ἐπλουτ.* (comp. Rev. iii. 17) have been taken as referring specially to *Christian knowledge* and other *endowments* (comp. i. 5), and *ἐβασιλ.* either as referring likewise to knowledge, the highest degree of it being meant (Vater, Heydenreich), or to high prosperity and repute in general (Calvin, Justiniani, Lightfoot, Wetstein, Platt, Pott), or to the quiet security in which kings live (Grotius), or to the “ *dominium et jus statuendi de rebus Christianis*” (Semler), or to the domination of the one sect over the other (Estius), or of the teacher over his party (Billroth is undecided between these two views). But all these interpretations fail to do justice to the *sarcastic method of expression*, although they *in part* correctly enough describe the *state of the case*, which is here ironically presented. (J) The right view may be seen in Hofmann also. In connection with the *ἐβασιλ.* left without being more precisely defined, nothing came so naturally and at once to the Christian consciousness as the thought of the *Messianic βασιλεία*.¹ And how well this idea corresponds to the wish

¹ So rightly also Schrader, Rückert, de Wette, Osiander, Ewald, Neander, Hof-

mann. Comp. Olshausen (who, however, gives a rationalizing view of the ruling).

which follows ! If, however, ἐβασ. applies to the *Messianic* ruling (see on iii. 22 ; Usteri, *Lehrbegriff*, p. 370), and consequently to the συμβασιλεύειν of 2 Tim. ii. 12, comp. Rom. viii. 17, then in that case κεκορ. and ἐπλουτ. also, to preserve the symmetry of this ironical picture, must be understood in the sense of the Messianic consummation of all things, and must denote the being full and rich κατ' ἐξοχήν (namely, in the blessings of the Messianic salvation), which for the Christian consciousness did not need to be particularly specified. Comp. Matt. v. 6 ; 2 Cor. viii. 9. The *perfect* brings before us the *state*, the aorists the *fact of having entered* upon the possession. See Kühner, *ad Xen. Mem.* i. 1. 18. As to ἤδη, i.e. *now already*, see on John iv. 35. — χωρὶς ἡμῶν] without whose work, in fact, you would not be Christians at all ! — καὶ ὄφελόν γε κ.τ.λ.] *and* (the thought suddenly striking his mind) *would that ye had indeed attained to dominion !* In the later Greek writers ὄφελον is used as a particle, and joined with the indicative, 2 Cor. xi. 1 ; Gal. v. 12. See Matthiae, p. 1162. Buttmann, *neut. Gr.* p. 185 [E. T. 214 f.]. Γέ strengthens the force of ὄφελον ; see Hartung, *Partikell.* I. p. 372 f. ; Baeumlein, *Partik.* p. 55 f. The thought is : “ Apart from this, that ye have *without us* become rulers, *would that ye had at least* (γέ) *become such !* ” Comp. Klotz, *ad Devar.* p. 281 f. — ἵνα κ. ἡμεῖς ὑμῖν συμβασ.] Ye would doubtless in that case, Paul deems, suffer us also to have some share (beside you) in your government ! The *subjunctive* is quite according to rule (in opposition to Rückert), seeing that ἐβασιλ. denotes something completed from the speaker's present point of view (*have become rulers*), and seeing that the design appears as one still subsisting in the present. See Klotz, *ad Devar.* p. 617 f. ; Stallbaum, *ad Plat. Crit.* p. 43 B. — Observe, we may add, how the sarcastic climax ends at last with καὶ ὄφελόν γε κ.τ.λ. in a way fitted to put the readers deeply to shame. Comp. Chrysostom.

Ver. 9. Γάρ] giving the ground of the foregoing wish : *For the position of us apostles is to my mind such, that to us the συμβασ. would even be a thing very desirable !* It is precisely the reverse of that ! — In δοκῶ we have a palpable point in the statement. Comp. on vii. 40. Without ὅτι following, see in Kühner, *ad Xen. Anab.* v. 7. 13. — ἡμᾶς τοὺς ἀπ.] does not refer simply to Paul (Calvin and others, including Schrader and Olshausen), which is forbidden by τοὺς ἀπ., but to the *apostles generally*. The designation τοὺς ἀποστ. is added by way of contrast to their position, in which they, instead of being at all privileged as apostles, were ἐσχατοί. Observe further, how in this passage, on to ver. 13, Paul paints his picture of the apostles in colours drawn from his own personal experience. — ἐσχάτους] Predicate : as *homines infimae sortis*. Comp. Mark ix. 35 ; Alciph. iii. 43 ; Dio Cassius, xlii. 5 ; Dem. 346, pen. It is joined with ἀποστ. by Erasmus, Castalio, Beza, and others, including Semler and Pott : “ Deus nos, qui postremi apostoli facti fuimus, tamquam ἐπιθαν. oculis alior. sistit ” (Pott). But in that case we should require to have τοὺς ἀπ. τοὺς ἐσχ., or at least τοὺς ἐσχ. ἀπ., because ἐσχ. would necessarily be the emphatic word ; and at any rate, looked at generally, this would give us an inappropriate and unhistorical contrast between the experiences of the later apostles and those of the first. — ἀπέδειξεν] not : *fecit, reddidit*, but : *He has set us forth, presented us as last,*

caused us to appear as such before the eyes of the world (see the following θέατρον κ.τ.λ.). Comp. 2 Thess. ii. 4 ; Plat. *Conv.* p. 179 C ; Dem. 687. 11 ; Xen. *Oec.* v. 10 ; Wyttenbach, *ad Plat. Phaed.* p. 72 C. — ὡς ἐπιθανατ.] *as men condemned to death*, so that we appear as such. How true in view of their constant exposure to deadly perils ! Comp. xv. 30 f. ; 2 Cor. xi. 23 ff. Tertullian's rendering (*de pudic.* 14) : “*veluti bestiarios*,” although adopted by Beza, Calvin, Grotius, Cornelius à Lapide, Michaelis, Schrader, and others, is an arbitrary limitation of the meaning. The correct explanation is given by Chrysostom and Theophylact. Comp. Dion. Hal. vii. 35. — ὅτι θέατρον ἔγεν. κ.τ.λ.] serves to make good the statement from δοκῶ to ἐπιθαν. ; hence it is a mistake to write ὁ, τι and connect it with θέατρ., as Hofmann conjectures should be done (“which spectacle we have in truth become to the world”). The meaning is : *seeing that we have become a spectacle*, etc. θέατρον is here like θέα or θέαμα, as Aesch. *Dial. Socr.* iii. 20 ; Ach. Tat. I. p. 55. Comp. θεατρίζεσθαι, Heb. x. 33 ; ἐκθεατρίζεσθαι, Polyb. iii. 91. 10, v. 15. 2. — καὶ ἄγγ. κ. ἀνθρ.] specializes the τῷ κόσμῳ : to the whole world, *both angels and men*. The inhabitants of heaven and of earth gaze upon our hardships and persecutions as on a spectacle. — The word ἄγγελοι in the N. T., standing *absolutely*, is never used of the good and bad angels taken together (this against Zeger, Bengel, Olshausen, *al.*), nor of the bad alone (this against Vatablus, Estius, Calovius, Wolf, and others, including Flatt and Neander), but always only of the angels κατ' ἐξοχήν, *i.e.* of the *good* angels (comp. on Rom. viii. 38). Where it refers to the bad angels, it always has some addition defining it so (Matt. xxv. 41 ; 2 Cor. xii. 7 ; 2 Pet. ii. 4 ; Jude 6). Hahn's objection is a trifling one (*Theol. d. N. T.* I. p. 261) : that the *angelic world generally* is meant ; comp. also Hofmann. Yes, but the evil angels are no longer therein ; see on Eph. ii. 2. Some have thought that we must bring in the *bad* angels, because θέατρον involves the idea : *a subject of mirth and mockery*. But this is purely arbitrary. The particular interest felt by the spectators in the drama of the apostolic fortunes might be very various, and even opposite in its nature ; it is not here taken into consideration at all. Theodoret says well : πᾶσιν εἰς θεωρίαν πρόκειται τὰ ἡμέτερα· ἄγγελοι μὲν γὰρ τὴν ἡμετέραν ἀνδρίαν θαυμάζουσι, τῶν δὲ ἀνθρώπων οἱ μὲν ἐφῆδονται τοῖς ἡμετέροις παθήμασιν, οἱ δὲ συναλγοῦσι μὲν, ἐπαμῦναι δὲ οὐκ ἰσχύουσιν. The way in which the angels come in here, therefore, must not be regarded as simply proverbial and figurative (Baur). (κ)

Ver. 10. What very different sort of people *ye* are from *us* ! — μῶροι διὰ Χ.] for, because we concern ourselves about nothing else save Christ the crucified, are bent on knowing Him only, and on having nothing to do with the world's wisdom (comp. ii. 2), we are foolish, weak-minded men, for Christ's sake. Comp. i. 18, 25. — φρόνιμοι ἐν Χ.] wise men are ye in your connection with Christ, sagacious, enlightened Christians ! Observe, that Paul could not write again διὰ Χ. ; the Christian pseudo-wisdom had *other* motives. The nature of the irony, “*plena aculeis*” (Calvin), with which he scourges the worldly state of things at Corinth, does not allow us to supply anything else here but ἐσμέν and ἐστέ. — ἀσθενεῖς] *weak and powerless*. For in trembling and humility they came forward, making little of human agency,

trusting for all success to the simple word of Christ. Ye, on the contrary, are *ισχυροί*, *men of power*, able to take up an imposing attitude and to carry through great things. Comp. ii. 3 ; 2 Cor. xiii. 2 ff., x. 10. By an arbitrary limitation, Chrysostom, Theophylact, Grotius, and Estius refer *ἀσθ.* to their *sufferings*: “Quia multa mala patimur, nec resistimus quod est infirmitatis,” and *ισχ.*: “Mala, si qua occurrunt, facile repellitis,” Estius. — *ἐνδοξοί*] *celebrated, highly honoured personages*; *ἄτιμοι*: *unhonoured, despised*, Matt. xiii. 57 ; Hom. *Il.* i. 516 ; Plato, *Legg.* vi. p. 774 B, *Euthyd.* p. 281 C. — In the last clause the *first* person is the subject of the sarcastic antithesis, because Paul means now to speak *at more length* regarding the apostles.

Vv. 11-13. Down to the present hour this despised condition of ours continues uninterruptedly, manifesting itself also (*καί*) in all manner of privations, sufferings, and humiliations. — The assumption that we are not to understand this *ἄχρι τῆς ἄρτι ὥρας*, as also *ἕως ἄρτι* in ver. 13,¹ in a strictly literal sense, is rash, seeing that, even apart from the fact that we have no other means of knowing the precise position of Paul at that time (comp. 2 Cor. xi. 27), he is speaking here not of himself alone, but of the position of the *apostles in general*. — *γυμνητεύομεν*] *i.e. we lack necessary raiment*. Comp. on *γυμνός* in Matt. xxv. 36 ; Jas. ii. 15 ; and Theile *in loc.* The *verb*, as used both in this sense and of being lightly armed, belongs to the later Greek. The form *γυμνιτεύομεν* (Lächmann and Tischendorf), although vouched for by a majority of the codd., is nothing but an ancient clerical error ; see Fritzsche, *de conform. Lahem.* p. 21. — *κολαφιζ.*] quite literally: *we are beaten with fists*. Comp. Matt. xxvi. 67 ; 1 Pet. ii. 20 ; 2 Cor. xii. 7. A concrete representation of rude maltreatment in general. — *ἀστατοῦμεν*] *we are unsettled*, have no abiding dwelling-place, Rufinus, *Ep.* 20. Theophylact: *ἐλάννόμεθα, φεύγομεν*. — *κοπιῶμεν κ.τ.λ.*] *we toil hard, working with our own hands*. Comp. as regards *Paul*, ix. 6 ff. ; 2 Cor. xi. 7 ff. ; 1 Thess. ii. 9 ff. ; 2 Thess. iii. 8 ; Acts xx. 34 ; and who is in a position to deny that *others* of the apostles too acted in the same way ? Paul includes this among the elements of their despised condition, which he adduces ; and he had a right to do so, for it was such in the eyes of the world, which could not and would not recognize and honour so noble a self-denial. — *λοιδορ. εὐλογ. κ.τ.λ.*] The picture of the ignominious condition of the apostles is continued, and its effect heightened by the contrast of their demeanour. We are so utterly empty and void of all honour with others, that as respects those who revile (insult, see Dissen, *ad Dem. de Cor.* p. 294), persecute, and slander us (*δυσφημ.*, see the critical remarks, and comp. 1 Macc. vii. 41 ; Aesch. *Ag.* 1078 ; Soph. *El.* 1182 ; Eur. *Heracl.* 600), we do not in any wise defend ourselves or seek vengeance against them (as men do who have honour to vindicate and maintain) ; but, on the contrary, *wish good* to our revilers, *remain quiet and patient* towards our persecutors, and

¹ The two expressions are synonymous ; hence, too, this passage is a proof that the distinction between *ἄχρι* and *μέχρι*, main-

tained by Tittmann, *Synon.* p. 33 ff., is erroneous. See Fritzsche, *ad Rom.* I. p. 308 ff.

give beseeching words to our slanderers.¹ Whether Paul says this in remembrance of the words of Jesus in Matt. v. 44, Luke vi. 27 f., which became known to him by tradition (Rückert and others), is very dubious, considering the difference of expression ; but the *disposition* required by Jesus lived in him. — ὡς περικαθάρματα κ.τ.λ.] Delineation, as a whole, of the condition hitherto—from ver. 11 onwards—sketched in single traits : *We have become as out-sweepings of the world, i.e. our experience has become such, as though we were the most utterly worthless of existing things, like dirt which men have swept off from the face of the world.* The κόσμος is the *world of men* (Rom. iii. 6, v. 12), corresponding to the πάντων which follows. Περικάθαρμα (from περικαθαίρω, to cleanse round about, on every side) means *quisquiliae*, what one removes by cleansing, both in a literal sense and figuratively, like our *offscourings, scum* (Arrian. *Diss. Epict.* iii. 22. 78). The simple κάθαρμα is more common ; and it especially is often found in this figurative sense in Demosthenes and later writers (see Wetstein, Loesner, *Obs.* p. 276 f. ; comp. also Kühner, II. p. 26). With this rendering Erasmus, H. Stephanus, Beza, Estius, and others, including, Rückert, de Wette, Ewald, Maier, Neander, Hofmann, are content, following Theodoret, Theophylact, and Oecumenius. Καθάρματα, however, is likewise used to denote those who, in times of plague and other public calamities, were offered up to expiate the wrath of the gods (see Schol. *ad Arist. Plut.* 454 ; Bos, *Exercitatt.* p. 125 ff. ; Munth. *Obs. e Diod.* p. 321 f.), and in Prov. xxi. 18, περικάθαρμα corresponds to the Hebrew בִּפְרָ, while περικαθαρμοός, too, in Plato, *Legg.* vii. p. 815 C, means *lustratio*, and περικαθαρτήριον in Hesychius (*sub voce* θεώματα), a *sacrifice for purification* ; and, on these grounds, Luther and many others (among them Pott, Olshausen, Osiander) assume that Paul refers here to that Greek sacrificial custom (see especially Photius, *Quaest. Amphil.* 155), and means by περικάθ. *expiatory sacrifices*,—the idea of “*reprobate, utterly worthless men*” being at the same time essentially involved, inasmuch as such men were taken for sacrifices of that nature (see Bos and Grotius). According to this view, the sense would be : “*contemnimur ut homines, qui ad iram Deorum ab omnibus hominibus avertendam sacrificio offeruntur,*” Pott ; and Olshausen asserts, in spite of the ὡς, that Paul ascribes a certain power even to his sufferings. Now the current and constant word for the *expiatory offering* is κάθαρμα (not περικάθαρμα) ;² but, even supposing that Paul had conceived περικαθάρματα as *piacula*, he would in that case have again used the *plural* περιψήματα in the next clause, for περίψημα is synonymous with περικάθαρμα, and each individual would be a *piaculum*. If, on the other hand, he conceived περικαθάρματα as *offscourings, castings away*, he could very suitably interchange this phrase afterwards with the collect-

¹ Παρακαλοῦμεν : being slandered, *we entreat*. See regarding παρακαλ., *to entreat*, Bleek on *Heb.* II. 1, p. 454 ff. Theophylact puts it happily : *πρατοτέροις λόγοις καὶ μαλακτικοῖς ἀμειβόμεθα*. Comp. Acts xvi. 39. Grotius explains it : *Deum pro ipsis precamur*. But *Deum* and *pro ipsis* are unwarrantably inserted on the ground of Matt. v. 10, 44.

Compare rather 2 Macc. xiii. 23 : τοὺς Ἰουδαίους παρεκάλεσεν, *he gave good words to the Jews*.

² Hence Valckenaer holds the reading of G, min., ὡςπερὶ καθάρματα, to be the true one, because Paul “*ritus Graecos noverat et linguam.*”

ive singular (*rubbish*). — πάντων περίψ.] *The refuse of all*. The emphasis lies on πάντων, and ὥς is to be supplied again before it. Περίψημα (what is removed by wiping) being substantially the same in meaning with περικάθαρμα (see Photius, s.v., Tob. v. 18, and Fritzsche *in loc.*), has been as variously interpreted by the commentators. — ἕως ἄρτι] belongs to ἐγενήθη:, and repeats with emphatic force at the close of the description the selfsame thought with which it had began in ver. 11. — The torrent is at an end ; now again we have the gentle stream of fatherly kindness, which, however, in ver. 18 once more swells into sternness and threatening. Observe how Paul at this point abandons the *comprehensive* plural form (ἡμεῖς), in order now at the close of the section to make his readers feel again, in the most impressive way, that *personal* relation of his to them, which he, as being the founder of the church, was entitled in truth to urge on their attention, despite of all the party-strife which had crept in.

Vv. 14–21. *Receive this censure* (from ver. 7 onwards) *not as meant to put you utterly to shame, but as an admonition from your spiritual father, whom ye ought to copy* (vv. 14–16), *for which cause I have also sent Timothy to you* (ver. 17). *But I—this by way of warning to those who are puffed up!—hope soon to come to you myself ; am I to come to punish, or in gentleness* (vv. 18–21) ?

Ver. 14. Οὐκ ἐντρέπων] The common interpretation is the correct one : *not putting you to shame*, not in such a way as to shame you, write I this (vv. 8–13). The *participle*, however, is not the same as an *infinitive*, but the meaning is : *I shame you not by what I am now writing to you*. See Heind. *ad Phaed.* p. 249 f. ; Stallbaum, *ad Plat. Rep.* p. 495 D ; Matthiae, p. 1289. Rückert prefers keeping to the general sense of *humbling, moving greatly* ; but why should we, when we have in 2 Thess. iii. 14, Titus ii. 8, 1 Cor. vi. 5, xv. 34, the perfectly distinctive Pauline notion of the word ? Comp. also Diog. L. ii. 29 ; Ael. V. H. iii. 17. And just because Paul feels the shaming element in his rebuke for the Corinthians, does he point out, so as to further the moral effect of his bitter words, what *according to his idea* his rebuke essentially is, not a putting to shame, but a fatherly admonition. Bengel says well : “Exquisita ἐπιθεραπεία . . . Saepe quendam quasi leporem apostolus salva gravitate apostolica adhibet.” — νοουθετῶ] The *kindly intention* of the admonition is not conveyed in the word by itself (see on Eph. vi. 4, and comp. e.g. Plato, *Pol.* viii. p. 560 A : νοουθετούντων τε καὶ κακιζόντων, Legg. ix. p. 879 D ; Dem. 798. 19, *al.*), but in the context. Comp. Acts xx. 31. Plato, *Euthyd.* p. 284 E : νοουθετῶ σ' ἐταῖρον. The *construction* is varied so as to give us not the participle again, but the indicative (as the opposite of ἐντρέπων γράφω, *taken together*), whereby the antithesis is made independent and so more emphatic. See Hermann, *ad Hymn. Hom.* p. 125. Kühner, II. p. 423.

Ver. 15 justifies the ὥς τέκνα μου ἀγαπ. νοουθετῶ. — *For suppose ye have ten thousand tutors in Christ*. On μυρίους,¹ compare Matt. xviii. 24. ; 1 Cor. xiv. 19. — Respecting the *paedagogi* among the Greeks and Romans (comp. יִסְטָן,

¹ The distinction drawn by the old grammarians between μύριοι (a numeral proper) and μυρίοι (an indefinitely large number) is

without foundation. See Buttmann, *ausführl. Sprachl.* I. p. 284 ; Ellendt, *Lex. Soph.* II. p. 144.

2 Chron. xxvii. 32 ; 2 Kings x. 1, 5 ; Esth. ii. 7 ; Rosenmüller, *Morgenl.* VI. p. 272), who, for the most part slaves, had it in charge to educate and give constant attendance upon boys till they came of age, see Wetstein and Hermann, *Privatalterth.* § 34. 15 ff. The name is *here* given *figuratively* to the *later workers* in the church, the ποτίζοντες (iii. 6–8), the ἐποικοδομοῦντες (iii. 10 ff.), in respect of their carrying on its further Christian development, after Paul (its *father*) had founded it, had given to it Christian life, had begotten it spiritually. Since the essential nature of the delineation here allowed of no other word alongside of πατέρας except παιδαγ., and since, moreover, Apollos also was reckoned among the παιδαγῶγοις, we are not warranted in finding here expressed the idea of *imperious and arrogant leadership on the part of the heads of parties* (Beza, Calvin, and others, including Pott, Heydenreich, de Wette, Osiander). Compare, too, Erasmus : “paedagogus saevit pro imperio.” It is not even the *inferior love* of the later teachers (Chrysostom, Theophylact) that Paul wishes to make his readers sensible of, but only his *rights as a father*, which can be in no way impaired by all who subsequently entered the same field. — ἀλλ’ οὐ π. πατ.] *sc. ἔχετε.* The ἀλλά after a hypothetical protasis is the *at* of emphatic contrast, *on the other hand* (Nägelsbach on the *Iliad*, p. 43, ed. 3 ; Baeumlein, *Partik.* p. 11 ; Klotz, *ad Devar.* p. 93), and that, too, without a restrictive γέ, in the sense of *at certe* ; see Kühner, *ad Xen. Anab.* vii. 7. 43. — ἐν γὰρ Χριστῷ κ.τ.λ.] *i.e. for in the life-fellowship of Jesus Christ no other than I myself has begotten you, through the gospel.* Just as ἐν Χριστῷ, in the first half of the verse, conveys the specific distinction of the παιδαγῶγους ἔχειν ; so here, and that with the emphatic addition of Ἰησοῦ, it conveys that of the moral generation, which has taken place, not out of Christ, but in Him as the element of its being ; and διὰ τοῦ εὐαγγελ. (comp. 1 Pet. i. 23) is the means whereby this establishment of their existence in the Christian sphere of life has been brought about. In both these respects it differs from physical generation. The antithetic emphasis of the ἐγὼ forbids us to refer ἐν Χ. Ἰ. to the person of the apostle : “*in my fellowship with Christ, i.e. as His apostle*” (de Wette, comp. Grotius, Calovius, Flatt, *al.*). — ἐγέννησα] Comp. ver. 17 ; Philem. 10 ; Gal. iv. 19. Sanhedr. f. 19. 2 : “Quicumque filium socii sui docet legem, ad eum scriptura refert, tanquam si eum genuisset.”

Ver. 16. Οὖν] since I am your father. — μιμ. μ. γίν.] *become imitators of me.* Paul does not add any more precise definition as to the matter (“*in cura tutandae in ecclesia tum unitatis tum sanctitatis,*” Grotius thinks, but without warrant in the context); but the connection of the passage, after vv. 6–13, leaves no room for doubt that he has in view the discarding of conceit and self-seeking, and the putting on of humility and self-denial. — As regards the phrase μιμ. γίν., comp. xi. 1 ; 1 Thess. i. 6, ii. 14 ; Eph. v. 1 ; Phil. iii. 17 ; and as regards the idea, Xen. *Mem.* i. 6. 3 : οἱ διδάσκαλοι τοὺς μαθητὰς μιμητὰς ἑαυτῶν ἀποδεικνύουσιν.

Ver. 17. Διὰ τοῦτο] namely, *in order to further among you this state of things meant by μιμ. μ. γίν.* Chrysostom, Theophylact, Piscator, Rückert, Maier, make it refer to ver. 15 : “on this ground, because I am your father.” But that would convert ver. 16, quite arbitrarily, into a strange

parenthetical interpolation. — ἔπεμψα ὑμ. Τιμ.] See Introd. § 2. He had already started upon his journey, but was not to arrive until after this Epistle had reached Corinth, xvi. 10 ; hence he must not be regarded as the bearer of it (Bleek). — τέκνον μου] comp. 1 Tim. i. 2, 18 ; 2 Tim. i. 2. The father sends to his children (ver. 14 f.) their brother, specially dear and faithful to himself, in whom, therefore, they too may have full trust. From the quite definite reference of τέκνα in ver. 14, comp. ver. 15, we are warranted in assuming with confidence that Timothy *had been converted by Paul*; his conversion, since in all likelihood he was from Lystra (see on Acts xvi. 1), being probably comprised in the statement in Acts xiv. 6, 7 ; for in Acts xvi. 1 he is already a Christian. — ἐν Κυρίῳ] specifies the characteristic relation in which Timothy is his beloved and faithful child (comp. Eph. vi. 21); for apart from the fellowship in faith and life with Christ, there is no relationship of father and son subsisting between Paul and Timothy at all. The expression is therefore not essentially different from ἐν πίστει, 1 Tim. i. 2. Comp. i. 3. — ἀναμνήσει] for the Corinthians seemed to have forgotten it.¹ — τὰς ὁδοὺς μου τὰς ἐν Χ.] *i.e. the paths, which I tread in Christ* (as my sphere of activity), *i.e. in the service of Christ*. The aim in view (διὰ τοῦτο) is to lead them to imitate the apostle by *reminding them of the whole way and manner, in which he conducted himself in his calling alike personally and relatively*; for must not the recalling of that conduct vindicate his character, so much misunderstood and depreciated in Corinth, and place it in such a light as would show it to be worthy of imitation? more especially in respect of his self-denial and humility, so far removed from the arrogance and self-seeking of the Corinthians. — καθὼς] is *commonly* taken as *defining more precisely* what has been already stated in a general way, as ὡς does in Rom. xi. 2, Luke xxiv. 20, Thuc. i. 1, and frequently elsewhere. See Bornemann in *Luc.* p. 141. But καθὼς means *sicut* (Vulgate), like the classical καθά or καθάπερ : *even as, in such fashion, as*.² We must therefore abide by the meaning of the word, and interpret : he will recall to your memories my official conduct *in such fashion, as I teach in all places*; *i.e.* he will represent it to you not otherwise than as it is everywhere exemplified in me by my capacity as a teacher, not otherwise therefore than in correspondence with the invariable method in which I discharge the vocation of my life, not otherwise, in short, than as it actually is everywhere. In this way καθὼς refers not to the contents of διδάσκω, nor to the mode of preaching (neither of which would stand in a relation of practical significance to μὴ μ. γίν.), but to the *peculiarity of character as a whole*, which distinguished Paul in his work as a teacher. — παντ. ἐν π. ἐκκλ.] This emphatic statement, with its double description, gives additional weight to the example to be imitated. Comp. Acts xvii. 30, xxi. 28.

Vv. 18. *As though now I were not coming to you, some are puffed up.* It is

¹ That Paul does not use διδάξει, to avoid giving offence, because Timothy was still young (Chrysostom, Theophylact), is an imagination pure and simple. Theodoret says aptly : λήθην δὲ αὐτῶν ὁ λόγος κατηγορεῖ·

αὐτόπται γὰρ ἐγεγόνεισαν τῆς ἀποστολικῆς ἀρετῆς.

² Billroth renders it rightly : *eodem modo, quo*, but inserts quite unwarrantably an *ipse* after the *quo*.

likely that these boasters, who belonged more probably to the Apollonians than to the Christ-party (ver. 19 f.), believed and affirmed that the apostle had not the courage to appear again in Corinth (2 Cor. x.1); and it is to prevent their being strengthened in their delusion by the mission of Timothy that Paul now adds these remarks, vv. 18-20. Hence we are not to make the new section begin here (Tertullian and Theodoret referred ἐφυσ. τινες even to the incestuous person, v. 1, and Theophylact makes it *include* a reference to him); on the contrary, it breaks upon us suddenly, like a thunderstorm, in v. 1. — Upon δέ as the fourth word in a sentence, see Winer, p. 519 [E. T. 699]. — ὥς, *as*, denotes : *on the assumption that*; see Matthiae, p. 1320. It introduces the ground of the ἐφυσίωθ. from the point of view of those that were puffed up. Comp. Kühner, II. p. 374; Lobeck, *ad Soph. Aj.* 281. — ἐρχου.] not for ἐλευσομένον (Flatt), but indicative of the subsisting relation. “*Paul is not coming*” was their conception, and this made them bold and boastful; φιλαρχίας γὰρ τὸ ἐγκλημα τῇ ἐρημίᾳ τοῦ διδασκάλου εἰς ἀπόνοιαν κεχρῆσθαι, Chrysostom. — τινές] as in xv. 12.

Ver. 19. Ἐλεύσομαι δέ] the contrast emphatically put first : *come, however, I will.* — ταχέως] Comp. Phil. ii. 24; 2 Tim. iv. 9. As to how long he thought of still remaining in Ephesus, see xvi. 8. — ὁ Κύριος] to be understood not of Christ, but of *God*.¹ See the critical remarks on Rom. xv. 32. Comp. Rom. i. 10; Jas. iv. 15. — γνώσομαι] what and how the boasters *speak* (τὸν λόγον), Paul will, on his approaching visit, leave wholly without notice; but as regards the amount of energy put forth by them in producing *results* for the kingdom of God, *of that* he will *take knowledge*. — τὴν δύναμ.] namely, *their power of working* for the advancement of the βασιλ. τ. Θεοῦ, ver. 20. To explain it as referring to the *power of miracles* (Chrysostom, Theophylact; not Grotius), or to the *power of their virtues* (Theodoret, Pelagius, Justin), is contrary to the context. Comp. what Paul says *of himself* in 1 Thess. i. 5. This practically effective *might*, which has for its primary condition the true power of the Spirit (of which de Wette understands it; we may recall Paul himself, Luther, etc.), was what the boasters *seemed* to have, but they let the matter rest at *words*, which were altogether lacking in the strength to effect anything. How wholly otherwise it was with Paul himself! Comp. ii. 4; 2 Cor. vi. 7.

Ver. 20. Justification of the γνώσομαι οὐ τὸν λόγον κ.τ.λ. by an axiom. — ἐν λόγῳ and ἐν δυνάμει describe wherein the βασιλεία *has its causal basis*; it has the *condition of its existence* not in speech, but in power (see on ver. 19). Comp. on ii. 5. The βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ, again, is not here, as it never is elsewhere (see on Matt. iii. 2, vi. 10), and in particular never in Paul's writings (neither in this passage nor in Rom. xiv. 7; Col. i. 13, iv. 11; see on these verses), the *church*, or the kingdom of God in the *ethical* sense (Neander : “the fellowship of the divine life, which is brought about by fellowship with the Redeemer”), but the *Messianic kingdom*, in which, at its expected (speedy) manifestation, those only can become members who are truly

¹ [But as the Apostle so constantly uses this word as a distinctive title of the Son (cf. vv. 4, 5), it seems more natural here to

suppose a reference to the will of Christ.— T. W. C.]

believing and truly sanctified (Col. iii. 3 f. ; Phil. iv. 18–21 ; Eph. v. 5, *al.*). (L) But faith and holy living are not established by high-soaring *speech* (not by τὰ ἐν τοῖς λόγοις φαντάσματα, Plat. *Soph.* p. 234 E), but by δύναμις, which is able effectively to procure gain for the kingdom (Col. i. 28 f. ; 1 Thess. i. 5 ; 1 Cor. ix. 19 ff. ; 2 Cor. x. 4 f.).

Ver. 21. As the *conclusion* of the entire section, we have here another warning useful for the readers as a whole, indicating to them the practical application which they generally were to make of the assurance of his speedy coming. Lachmann, followed by Hofmann (after Oecumenius, Cajetanus, Beza, Calvin), begins the new section with ver. 21. But this appears hardly admissible, since chap. v. 1 commences without any connective particle (such as ἀλλά, or δέ, or γάρ),¹ and since, too, in v. 1 ff. there is no further reference to the speedy arrival of the apostle. — τί] in the sense of πότερον. Comp. Plato, *Phil.* p. 52 D, and Stallbaum *in loc.* He *fears* the first, and *wishes* the second. “Una quidem charitas est, sed diversa in diversis operatur,” Augustine. — ἐν ῥάβδῳ] *with a rod* ; but this is no Hebraism, for ἐν denotes in pure Greek the *being provided with*. Heb. ix. 25 ; 1 John v. 6. See Matthiae, p. 1340 ; Buttmann, *neut. Gr.* p. 284 [E. T. 330]. Comp. Eccus. xlvii. 4: ἐν λίθῳ, armed with a stone. Lucian, *D. M.* xxiii. 3: καθιζόμενος ἐν τῇ ῥάβδῳ. The meaning of the figurative phrase, borrowed as it is from the relation of *father*, is : ἐν κολάσει, ἐν τιμωρίᾳ, Chrysostom. — ἔλθω] *am I to come?* See Winer, p. 268 [E. T. 356]. Chrysostom puts it happily: ἐν ὑμῖν τὸ πρᾶγμα κεῖται. — πνεύματί τε πραοτ.] not: with “a gentle spirit” (Luther, and most interpreters), so that πνεῦμα would be the *subjective* principle which should dispose the inner life to this quality ; but: *with the Spirit of gentleness*, so that πνεῦμα is to be understood, with Chrysostom and Theophylact, of the *Holy Spirit* ; and πραοτ. denotes that specific *effect* of this πνεῦμα (Gal. v. 22) which from the context is brought peculiarly into view. So in all the passages of the N. T. where πνεῦμα, meaning the *Holy Spirit*, is joined with the genitive of an abstract noun ; and in each of these cases the connection has indicated *which* effect of the Spirit was to be named. Hence He is called πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας (John xv. 26, xvi. 13 ; 1 John iv. 6), νιοθεσίας (Rom. viii. 15), τῆς πίστεως (2 Cor. iv. 13), σοφίας (Eph. i. 17), δυνάμεως κ.τ.λ. (2 Tim. i. 7), just according as the one or other effect of His working is exhibited by the context as characteristic of Him. Respecting the present passage, comp. vi. 1. It is to be observed, moreover, that the apostolic *rod of discipline* too is wielded in the power of the Holy Spirit, so that the selfsame Spirit works as a Spirit of gentleness and of corrective severity : ἔστι γὰρ πνεῦμα πραότητος καὶ πνεῦμα αὐστηρότητος, Chrysostom. Comp. on Luke ix. 55. — Instead of the form πραότης, Lachmann and Tischendorf have, in every passage in which it occurs in Paul’s writings, the later πραύτης (except that in Gal. vi. 1 Lachmann retains πραότης ; see regarding both, Lobeck, *ad Phryn.* p. 403 f.). The change is justified by weighty testimony, especially that of A B C (although they are

¹ For to regard v. 1 as an *answer* which Paul gives to *himself* unto his own question, as Hofmann does, is a forced device, which,

in view of τί θέλετε alone, is not even logically practicable.

not unanimous in the case of all the passages). In the other places in which it is found, Jas. i. 21, iii. 13, 1 Pet. iii. 15, *πρᾶντης* is undoubtedly the true reading.

NOTES BY AMERICAN EDITOR.

(J) *Paul's irony.* Ver. 8.

The natural force of this verse is not to be denied or evaded. As Calvin says, the Apostle, after seriously and without figures of speech repressing the vain confidence of the Corinthians, proceeds ironically to deride them. Nor is this the only place in Scripture where such language occurs. It is to be found in the Old Testament (1 Kings xviii. 27, Job xii. 1, etc.), and also in the Second Epistle to the Corinthians (xi. 19, 20). And experience seems to show that there are occasions when no other form of speech will answer, and yet of course this is not to be lightly assumed. The Bible gives no warrant for a continuous or even prevailing tone of irony or satire. As Burke said of another matter, an extreme medicine must not be turned into one's daily bread. Perhaps the rule laid down by Hodge (*in loc.*) is sufficient to answer the purpose. "If the thing assailed be both wicked and foolish, and if the motive be, not the desire to give pain, but to convince and convert," the use of these dangerous weapons is justifiable.

(K) *The spectacle to the universe.* Ver. 9.

The imagery in this striking verse is evidently drawn from the games in the amphitheatre, so familiar to the Roman world. The phrase "appointed to death" seems naturally to suggest the gladiators who came out into the arena and saluted the ruler of the spectacle, calling themselves *morituri*, about to die. In the writer's view, he and his fellow-apostles were led forth, not simply before the gaze of the thousands or tens of thousands gathered under the open sky in a huge structure of wood or stone, but upon the world's broad stage, where all created beings, from men up to angels, gaze with wonder upon the dreadful death-struggle, while the selfish Corinthians sat by, unconcerned and unmoved at the awful spectacle. Stanley quotes Seneca's description (Provid. iii.) of the wise man struggling with fate : "Ecce spectaculum dignum ad quod respiciat intentus operi suo Deus." But the Apostle represents God as the One who appointed the spectacle, and all other beings as lookers-on in wonder and sympathy.

(L) *The "Kingdom of God."* Ver. 20.

The author's restriction of this term to the Messianic Parousia is one of the few peculiarities (another is his insisting that *ὅτι* must always be construed as *telic*, *in order that*) which are a drawback to his general excellence. The term here may just as well denote the existing church as its final manifestation in the great day ; nay, it should rather have that meaning, to bring out the full force of the Apostle's argument. The best rebuke of the offensive inflation of his adversaries, who boasted instead of working, was to assure them that the present administration of God's cause in the earth was not in profession only, but attended with divine power. That such would be the case hereafter they might easily admit, but what was needed was to render them sensible of its divine efficacy now and here.

CHAPTER V.

Ver. 1. After *ἐθνεσιν* Elz. has *ὀνομάζεται*, which is defended by Matthaei and Reiche, but in the face of quite decisive evidence. Supplied, perhaps from Eph. v. 3. Equally decisive is the evidence against *ἐξαρθῆ*, ver. 2 (Elz.). From ver. 13. — Ver. 2. *ποιήσας*] Rück. and Tisch. read *πράξας*, which Griesb. too, *recommended, with A C $\aleph$, min. Or. ? Manes (in Epiph.), Epiph. Bas. The external evidence is pretty evenly balanced. But at all events the phrase *ποιεῖν ἔργον* was very familiar to the transcribers from the N. T. ; hence *πράξας* should have the preference. — Ver. 3. *ἀπὸν*] Elz. Scholz, Tisch. have *ὡς ἀπ.*, against A B C D* $\aleph$, min. and several vss. and Fathers. According to the analogy of the *ὡς παρῶν* which follows, *ὡς* (as embracing the whole *ἀπὸν . . . πνεύμ.*) was first of all written on the margin, and then taken into the text. — Ver. 4. *Ἰησοῦ* alone (without *Χριστοῦ*) is the reading in both cases of A B D, Aeth. Clar. Lucif., and, as regards the second, of several other vss. and Fathers. So also Lachm. Rück. and Tisch. Rightly ; the solemn character of the address gave occasion to the addition of *Χριστοῦ*. — Ver. 5. *τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ*] So also $\aleph$. Rückert reads *τοῦ Κυρ. ἡμῶν Ἰ. Χριστοῦ*, with evidence of considerable weight in favour of it, but probably taken from i. 8. Lachm. brackets *ἡμῶν Ἰ. Χ.* ; for B, Or. (thrice) Tert. (twice) Epiph. Aug. (once) Hilar. Pacian, have simply *τοῦ Κυρίου*. So Tisch. But since *Ἰησοῦ* occurs in *all* the other witnesses except those few, and since their discrepancies concern only *ἡμῶν* and *Χριστοῦ*, the Rec. *τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ* should be retained ; for *Ἰησοῦ* might very easily be overlooked, especially where four words, one after another, end in *ΟΥ*. — Ver. 6. *ζυμοῖ*] The various readings *δολοῖ* (D*, Bas. Hesych., recommended by Griesb.) and *φθείρει* (Lat. in Cerular. ; *corrumpit* : Vulg. Clar. and Latin Fathers) are interpretations. — Ver. 7. After *ἐκκαθάρ.* Elz. has *οὖν*, against a great preponderance of evidence. A connective addition, as are also *καί* before *οὖν* in ver. 10, and *καί* before *ἐξαρ.* in ver. 13. After *ἡμῶν* Elz. and Scholz read *ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν*, contrary to decisive testimony. An inappropriate (for the apostle is speaking only of the death of Christ *in itself*, see Reiche, *Comm. crit.* I. p. 161 ff.) dogmatic gloss. — Ver. 10 *ἡ ἀρπ.*] *καὶ ἀρπ.* is the reading of almost all the uncials and Clar. Boern. (so Lachm. Rück. and Tisch.) ; *ἡ* was mechanically taken up from the context. — Ver. 11. Instead of *ἡ* before *πόρν.* Elz. has *ἡ*, contrary to Syr. utr. Erp. Copt. Vulg. Ir. Tert. Chrys. and many other Fathers, also some min. The *ἡ*, which occurs in B** D $\aleph$, came in mechanically from the succeeding context. — Ver. 12. *καί*] is wanting in A B C F G $\aleph$, min. and several vss. and Fathers (suspected by Griesb., deleted by Lachm. and Rück.) ; the authorities which omit it are so decisive, that it must be regarded as an addition in favour of the apostolic power of discipline as respects those that are within. — Ver. 13. *ἐξαρεῖτε*] *ἐξάρατε*, approved by Griesb., adopted by Lachm. Rück. and Tisch., has perfectly conclusive evidence in its favour. The former reading has arisen from Deut. xxiv. 7, a passage which has also given origin to the weakly-attested *καί* before *ἐξαρ.* in Elz.

Vv. 1-8. *Reproof and apostolical judgment respecting an incestuous person in the church.*

Ver. 1. The censure of the party-divisions is concluded. Without note of transition, but after the closing words of iv. 21 with all the more telling force, the discourse falls with severity at once upon another deep-seated evil in the church. — ὅλως] means simply *in general, in univcrsum*, as in vi. 7, xv. 29, Matt. v. 34, and in Greek writers ; it belongs to ἀκούεται, so that to the *general* expression ὅλως ἀκούεται πορν. there corresponds the *particular* καὶ τοιαύτη πορν., *sc. ἀκούεται*. The latter, however, is something worse than the former, hence the καὶ is *intensive* (Hartung, *Partikell.* I. p. 134 ; Baeumlein, *Partik.* p. 147) : *One hears generally (speaking broadly) of fornication among you, and even of such fornication one hears among you, as is not found among the heathen themselves.* To render it *certainly* (so as to indicate that it is no *dubius rumor, sed res manifesta* ; so Calvin, Beza, Piscator, Estius, Elsner, Calovius, Wolf, *al.*) or *universally* (Schrader, Ewald) is against the meaning of the word, which may, indeed, signify *prorsus* or *omnino* (Vulgate), but neither *ubique* nor *certainly*.¹ Rückert thinks that it assigns the ground by means of a generalization for the thought which is to be supplied after iv. 21 : I fear that I shall have to use severity ; and that Paul would more fittingly have written γοῦν. This is arbitrary, and even in point of logic doubly incorrect, because ὅλως here introduces the report of a quite *special* offence, and therefore cannot assign a ground by *generalization* ; and because, if the *restrictive* γοῦν would have been better in this passage, Paul in using the *generalizing* ὅλως must have expressed himself *illogically*. — ἐν ὑμῖν] not : *as occurring among you* (comp. Ewald), for it is a defining statement which belongs to ἀκούεται ; but : *one hears talk among you of fornication*, one comes to hear of it in your community. Paul expresses the state of things as it was perhaps made known to him by Chloe's people (i. 11) or others who came from Corinth, and spoke to him in some such way as this : *In the Corinthian church one learns the existence of fornication, etc. ; such things as these one is forced to hear of there !* — ἐν τοῖς ἔθν.] ἀεὶ ἀπὸ τῶν ἐθνικῶν ὀνειδίζει τοῖς πιστοῖς, Chrysostom. Regarding the prohibition among the Jews : Lev. xviii. 8 ; Deut. xxii. 30 ; Philo, *de spec. leg.* p. 301 ; Michaelis, *Mos. R.* II. p. 206 ; Saalschütz, *Mos. R.* p. 766 f. The instances of such incest among the Greeks and Romans (see Maji *Obs.* I. p. 184) were *exceptions* contrary to law (see Elsner, p. 90 ; Wetstein and Pott *in loc.*), and abhorred (Wetstein, *l.c.*).² — γυναικα τοῦ πατρός] *i.e.* בִּן תַּשָּׁא, *stepmother*, Lev. xviii. 8, and the Rabbinical authorities in Lightfoot, p. 166. It was, no doubt, in view of the prohibition announced in Lev. xviii. 8 that Paul chose this form of expression (instead of the Greek designation μητρὶά), ὥστε πολλῶ χαλεπώτερον πλῆξαι, Chrysostom. The departure from the usual arrangement of the words, too, γυναικά τινα τοῦ πατρός, puts an emphasis of ignominy upon γυναικα. — ἔχειν] Many expositors, such as Calvin, Rückert, Neander, leave it undecided whether this refers to having her in *marriage*

¹ [The R. V. gives the sense happily by the term "actually."—T. W. C.]

² [Cicero (pro Cluentio, 5, 6) mentions it

as a crime incredible, and, with the exception of the case he is speaking of, unheard of.—T. W. C.]

(Vorstius, Michaelis, Billroth on 2 Cor. vii. 12, Maier) or in *concubinage* (Grotius, Calovius, Estius, Cornelius à Lapide, Pott, Olshausen, Osiander, Ewald, Hofmann). But in favour of the former there is, first of all, the fact that ἐχω is never used in the N. T. in such a sense as that of the well-known ἐχω λατρεῖν (Diog. Laert. ii. 75 ; Athen. xxii. p. 544 D), or “*quis heri Chrysidem habuit?*” (Terent. *Andr.* i. 1. 58), but always of possession *in marriage*¹ (Matt. xiv. 4, xxii. 28 ; Mark vi. 18 ; 1 Cor. vii. 2, 29. Comp. 1 Macc. xi. 9 ; Hom. *Od.* iv. 569 ; Herod. iii. 31 ; Thuc. ii. 29. 1 ; Xen. *Cyr.* i. 5. 4 ; Gregor. Cor. 931, ed. Schaef. ; Maetzn. *ad Lycurg.* p. 121) ; but further, and more especially, the use of the past tenses ποιήσας, ver. 2, and κατεργασάμενον, ver. 3, to designate the matter, which convey not the conception of illicit intercourse, but that of an incestuous marriage *having actually taken place*. Paul ranks this case under the head of πορνεία (see on Matt. v. 32) ; because, in the first place, he needed this general notion in order to describe the state of licentiousness subsisting at Corinth *generally*, and now further intends to designate definitely by κ. τοιαύτη πορν. κ.τ.λ. the *particular* occurrence which is included under this general category. Matt. v. 32, xix. 9, should have sufficed to keep Hofmann from asserting that πορνεία proves the case not to have been one of adultery. The objection, again, that Paul does not insist upon a divorce, is of no weight ; for he does insist upon excommunication, and, after that had taken place, the criminal marriage—if the offender were not thereby sufficiently humbled to dissolve the connection of his own accord—would no longer concern the Christians (see vv. 12, 13). Another objection : How could the magistrates have tolerated such a marriage ? is obviated, partly by the consideration that in that large and morally corrupt city the magisterial eye was doubtless blind enough, especially on the point of the κορινθιάζεσθαι (see *Introduct.* § 1) ; and partly by remembering the possibility that the offender, whether previously a Jew or—which is more likely—a heathen, having turned Christian, might put forward in his own defence before the tolerant magistracy the Rabbinical axiom that the becoming a proselyte, as a new birth, did away with the restrictions of forbidden degrees (Maimonides, *Jebhamoth*, f. 982 ; Michaelis, *Einl.* § 178, p. 1221 ; Lübker in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1835, p. 698 f.). Whether or not he belonged to one of the four parties (as, for example, to that of Apollos), we need not attempt to decide. See remark at the end of this chapter. — As to the *wife* of the incestuous person, nothing can be affirmed with certainty, and with probability only this, that she was *not a Christian*, else Paul would have censured her conduct also. Her *former husband* was still alive (so that she must have been divorced from or have deserted him), and was probably a Christian ; 2 Cor. vii. 12.

Ver. 2. A question suddenly introduced with *and*, laying bare the incongruity of this state of things with the attitude previously noticed (see Hartung, *Partikell.* I. p. 146 f.). — ὑμεῖς emphatic : *Ye*, the people among whom so disgraceful a thing can occur ; for κοινὸν πάντων τὸ ἐγκλημα γέγονε,

¹ Even in John iv. 18, where, however, the word must be kept in the peculiar significant mode of expression which be-

longs to the passage, as applied to an irregular, not real or legal marriage.

Chrysostom. — πεφυσ. ἐστέ] What is meant is the spiritual self-conceit already censured (iv. 6 ff., 18) regarding the lofty degree of Christian wisdom and perfection in general, which they supposed themselves to have reached ; not pride in the incestuous person himself, who is conceived to have been a highly-esteemed teacher (Chrysostom, Theophylact, Grotius). — ἐπενθήσ.] *are fallen into distress* (penitential mourning), for by reason of the fellowship between Christians (comp. xii. 26) ἔδει πενθῆσαι, διότι εἰς τὸ κοινὸν τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἡ διαβολὴ προεχώρησεν, Theophylact, comp. Chrysostom. — ἵνα ἀρθῇ κ.τ.λ.] The design which, according to the apostle's view, the ἐπενθ. ought to have had, and the attainment of which would have been its result, had it taken place : *in order that he might be removed*, etc. It intensifies and completes the contrast with their conceited self-assurance, and leads appropriately to the introduction of *his own judicial sentence*, which comes in, ver. 3, with ἐγὼ μὲν γάρ κ.τ.λ. ; all the less, therefore, is ἵνα ἀρθῇ κ.τ.λ. to be regarded as forming such a judicial utterance (Pott, Hofmann) standing forth with imperative independence : *Away with him*, etc. (see on 2 Cor. viii. 7). That does not come in until ver. 13. — ἔργον] *facinus*, the nature of which is shown by the context. See Ellendt, *Lex. Soph.* I. p. 671.¹

Ver. 3. Ἐγὼ μὲν γάρ] introduces the independent resolution already arrived at by himself, and therewith the justification of the ἵνα ἀρθῇ ; *for he, Paul, for his part, has resolved already to inflict a yet heavier punishment upon him*. Comp. also Winer, p. 422 [E. T. 568] ; the contents of vv. 3–5 correspond to the ἵνα ἀρθῇ in its connection with καὶ . . . ἐπενθήσ. The μέν *solitarium* must be taken as meaning : *I at least*. See Hermann, *ad Viger.* p. 841 f. ; Wunder, *ad Soph. Phil.* 159 ; Hartung, *Partikell.* II. p. 413. — τῷ πνεύματι] Comp. ver. 4 : τοῦ ἐμοῦ πνεύματος, hence not to be understood, as Chrysostom and others hold,² of the *Holy Spirit*, against which τῷ σώματι also militates, comp. vii. 34 ; Rom. viii. 10 ; Col. ii. 5. — ἤδη κέκρ. ὡς παρών] *have made up my mind already, as though I were present* (personally superintending your community).³ — τὸν οὕτω τοῦτο κατεργ.] belongs to παράδ. τῷ Σατ., ver. 5, so that, after the intermediate statements which follow, the object of the sentence is taken up again by τὸν τοιοῦτον in ver. 5 (*hunc talem inquam*), comp. 2 Cor. xii. 2. See Matthiae, p. 1045 ; Schaefer, *Melet.* p. 84. Bengel says happily : “*Graviter suspensa manet et vibrat oratio usque ad ver. 5.*” Not so happy is Hofmann's view, that τὸν . . . κατεργ. belongs to κέκρικα as an accusative of the object, whereupon παραδοῦναι κ.τ.λ. is then set down to a mixing up of two constructions, this being coupled with an inappropriate comparison of Mark xiv. 64. — οὕτω] *after such fashion, in such a way*. The way and manner thereby referred to as aggravating the offence were known to the readers, but are unknown to us. Respecting οὕτω in a

¹ [This verse is read as a question in the Syriac version and the Greek Fathers, and by Canon Evans in Speaker's Com. The sense is the same.—T. W. C.]

² So, too, Holsten, *z. Ev. d. Paul. u. Petr.* p. 385.

³ Were the ὡς before ἀπὸν the genuine reading,—and Hofmann persists in retain-

ing it as such, notwithstanding that cod. S, too, has added its weight to the side of the overwhelming contrary testimony,—this ὡς might be very simply distinguished from that which stands before παρὼν in *this way*, that the first ὡς would mean *as*, and the second *as if*.

bad sense, see on John xviii. 22, and Bremi, *ad Dem. Phil.* I. p. 120. Pott and Olshausen explain it wrongly : “*licet Christianus sit*,” which is not implied in the text, and would state nothing special, for it was a matter of course that the person in question was not a non-Christian. — κατεργ.] *has perpetrated*, more emphatic than ποιήσας, ver. 2. See on Rom. i. 27.

Ver. 4. Four different ways of dividing the verse are possible : *either* ἐν τῷ ὀνόμ. belongs to συναχθ. and σὺν τῇ δυν. to παραδοῦναι (Beza, Justiniani, Calovius, Heydenreich, Billroth, Olshausen, Ewald, Hofmann), *or* both belong to συναχθ. (Chrysostom, Theodoret, Theophylact, Calvin, Grotius, Rückert), *or* both belong to παραδοῦναι (Mosheim, Pott, Flatt, Schrader, comp. also Osiander) ; *or* ἐν τ. ὀνόμ. belongs to παραδοῦναι, and σὺν τ. δυνάμ. to the participial clause. Against the second and third of these views, there is the fact that the symmetry of the address would be needlessly destroyed by bringing in the authority of Christ twice over in the one division, and not at all in the other ; against the first, again, there is this, that ἐν τῷ ὀνόμ. κ.τ.λ., as a solemn formula of apostolic enactment (2 Thess. iii. 6 ; Acts iii. 6, xvi. 18), links itself more suitably to the sense with παραδοῦναι κ.τ.λ. than with συναχθ. κ.τ.λ. (to the latter of which Matt. xviii. 20, εἰς τὸ δν., might seem to offer not exactly a parallel, but still a similar representation). There remains therefore, as worthy of preference, the fourth method of connecting the words (Luther, Castalio, Estius, Bengel, Maier, *al.* ; Neander with hesitation).¹ Against this, Hofmann objects that ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι κ.τ.λ. ought not to have come in until after the participial clause ; but quite under a misapprehension, for it is plainly of set purpose, and with all reason and propriety, that the apostolic sentence bears, so to speak, *on its very front* the seal of his *high and plenary authority*. — συναχθέντων . . . Ἰησοῦ] *after ye are assembled, and my spirit* (note the emphatic τ. ἐμοῦ), *with the power of Jesus* (“*qui nostram sententiam sua potentia reddet efficacem*,” Erasmus, *Paraphr.*). The substance of the thought, namely, which this whole statement sets before us with concrete vividness and solemnity, is the following : I have already resolved *that ye hold an assembly of the church, in which ye shall consider me as present furnished with the power of Christ, and in this assembly shall declare* : “*Paul, in the name of Christ, with whose power he is here spiritually in the midst of us, hereby delivers over the incestuous man unto Satan.*” Φρίκης μεστὸν συνεκρότησε δικαστήριον, Theodoret. — σὺν] denotes *in efficient connection therewith*, that is to say, the spirit of the apostle is present in the assembly, not in virtue of his own independent power (comp. Acts iii. 12), but clothed with the authority of Christ, Winer, p. 366 [E. T. 458].² Thus the power of Christ is not conceived as the third party in the assembly,—a view in behalf of which Matt. xviii. 20, xxviii. 20 are cited ; so Chrysostom, Theodoret, Theophylact, Erasmus, Luther, Estius, and others, including Rückert and Maier.³ For Paul bore this power in himself, being as an apos-

¹ [So Stanley, Beet, Principal Brown, *et al.*—T. W. C.]

² [It is a serious objection to this view that it would naturally require the preposition before δυνάμει to be not σὺν but ἐν.

—T. W. C.]

³ Chrysostom and Theophylact, however, leave the choice open between the two renderings : ἡ ὅτι ὁ Χριστὸς δύναται τοιαύτην ὑμῖν χάριν δοῦναι, ὥστε δύνασθαι τῷ διαβόλῳ

tle its official possessor and organ, and *could* not therefore imagine himself meeting with other persons and with it in the third place, but : as being present in *immanent union with it* as Christ's apostle at the eventual act of judgment. It was just as the depositary of this power that he could give over the sinner to Satan in the name of the Lord, and be assured that the sentence would take effect. According to Hofmann, by *σὺν τ. δυν. κ.τ.λ.* Paul means only to express this, that he *would rely upon the aid* of the power of Christ. Comp. the classic *σὺν θεοῖς, deorum ope* (Reisig, *Enarr.* p. lxiv. ; Kühner, *ad Xen. Anab.* iii. 2. 8). But the thought thus yielded, after the *ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι κ.τ.λ.* which has gone before it, would be far too weak.

Ver. 5. *Τὸν τοιοῦτον*] *the so-constituted*, comprises in one word the whole abhorrent character¹ of the man. Note the similar expression in 2 Cor. ii. 7. — *παρὰδοῦναι τῷ Σατανᾷ*] is—although the phrase may not occur in Jewish formulae of excommunication (Lightfoot, *Horae*, p. 167 ff., but see Pfaff, *Orig. jur. eccles.* p. 72 ff.)—the characteristic designation of *the higher Christian grade of excommunication, with which there was essentially joined the ordaining in the power of the apostolic office* (not simply the *presupposition*, as Billroth's rationalizing interpretation has it), *that Satan should plague the person delivered over to him with corporeal inflictions*. Therein consisted the difference between this peculiar species of the *חַרֵם* which had passed over from the synagogue to the church, and the simple *αἰρεῖν ἐκ μέσου*, ver. 2, comp. ver. 13. The latter could be performed by the *church* itself, whereas the *παρὰδοῦναι τῷ Σατ.* appears in this passage, as in 1 Tim. i. 20, to be reserved for the plenary authority of an *apostle*. It pertained to the apostolic *ἐξουσία*, 2 Cor. xiii. 10. Comp. the analogous penal power in the cases of Ananias and Elymas, Acts v. 1 ff., xiii. 9 ff. The *simple* exclusion belonged to the church independently, ver. 2 ; and the apostle calls upon them in ver. 13 to exercise this right of theirs. To himself, again, in the power of Christ, belonged the title and the power to inflict the *intensified* penalty of excommunication, the delivery to Satan, of which, accordingly, he does not say that *the church* ought to execute it, but that *he* has already resolved, etc. Observe, too, that *παρὰδοῦναι* is *active* ; he does not say *παρὰδοθῆναι*, but *he himself* will do it. There is no reason to doubt the fact of this power being the prerogative of the apostleship, as the higher authority vested with power to punish² (Lipsius *Rechtfertigungsl.* p. 181, Hofmann) ; comp. also Ritschl, *altkath. Kirche*, p. 373. As regards the special assumption, again, that the thought would be complete in itself without *τῷ Σατανᾷ* (Hofmann), 1 Tim. i. 20 should have been enough, even taken singly, to preclude it ; for, judging from that passage, one might rather say that *εἰς ὀλεθρον τ. σαρκός* was obvious of itself. The delivery over

παρὰδιδόσαι, ἢ ὅτι καὶ αὐτός μεθ' ὑμῶν κατ' αὐτοῦ φέρει τὴν ψῆφον. According to Theodoret, Christ is viewed as the *presiding authority*. Had the apostle, however, represented Christ to himself as forming the third in their meeting, he would hardly have used so abstract an expression (*δυνάμει*), but would have written at least

σὺν τῷ πνεύματι τοῦ Κυρίου. Comp. Acts xv. 28.

¹ Ellendt, *Lex. Soph.* II. p. 843.

² Even if 1 Tim. is not an apostolic Epistle, 1 Tim. i. 20 is at all events written in the *belief* that the delivery to Satan was effected not by the church, but by *the apostle*.

to Satan can only be viewed as an *express* and *declaratory* act of relegation from Christian fellowship into the power of the ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου ; not as if Satan were but he, “through whom the evil-doer should *come to experience* what was *destined* for him” (Hofmann), which would not imply an exclusion from the church at all. Many other expositors, following Chrysostom and appealing to the case of Job, find here *only* the handing over to Satan *for bodily chastisement*,¹ and *not along* with that the *excommunication* (Lightfoot, Bochart, Wolf, *al.*). But this is against the connection, according to which (see vv. 2, 13) the παραδ. τῷ Σατανᾷ cannot belong to a different category from the αἰρεῖν ἐκ μέσου. At the same time it is not quite identical with it,² not *simply a description of the excommunication*. (Calvin, Beza, and others, including Semler, Stolz, Schrader, Maier), seeing that the bodily result is indicated by εἰς ὄλεθρ. τ. σαρκ. as *essential* and as explaining itself to the reader without further interpretation. — εἰς ὄλεθρ. τ. σαρκ.] is that which is to be effected by Satan on the man delivered over to him : *for behoof of destruction of the flesh, i.e.* in order that (ἔλκει πονηρῷ ἢ νόσῳ ἑτέρα, Chrysostom), his *sinful fleshly nature*, which is turned to account by the indwelling power of sin as the work-place of his desires and lusts, might be emptied of its energy of sinful life by the pains of bodily sickness, and might in so far perish and come to nought.³ It is not his σῶμα that is to *die*, but his σάρξ (Rom. viii. 13 ; Col. iii. 5). The reason why the word σάρξ is here purposely selected, and not the ethically indifferent σῶμα, was correctly discerned by so early an expositor as Chrysostom, although many more recent interpreters, such as Rückert, have failed to perceive it. Hofmann also takes, in substance, the right view, *Schriftbeweis*, I. p. 462. To make, however, as he does (p. 105), the ὄλεθρ. τ. σαρκ. the same as διαφθείρεται ὁ ἕξω ἡμῶν ἄνθρωπος, 2 Cor. iv. 15, accords neither with the real meaning nor with the ethical relations of the case. As regards the two telic statements : εἰς ὄλεθρ. τ. σ. and ἵνα τὸ πνεῦμα κ.τ.λ. (which last expresses the *final design* of the whole measure of the παραδοῦναι κ.τ.λ.), observe that it is with an *anti-Christian purpose* that Satan smites the man delivered over to him with bodily misery, but that against his own will this purpose of his is made to

¹ So also Grotius, who, moreover,—and in this Billroth follows him,—rationalizes παραδοῦναι into *precari Deum, ut eum tradat*.

² So, too, Theophylact on 1 Tim. *l.c.* Comp. Balsamon, *ad Can.* vii. *Basil.* p. 938, where it is said that we term subjects of Satan : οἱ χωριζόμενοι ἀπὸ τῆς κοινωνίας τῶν πιστῶν, similarly Theodore of Mopsuestia in *Cram. Cat.* p. 92, who explains it of the *excommunication* (the *result* of which is the dominion of Satan ; and Paul gives the name here from that *result*, in order the more to *overawe*), and then ὄλεθρον σαρκός : τὴν κατὰ τὸν παρόντα βίον διὰ τῆς μεταμελείας συντριβήν. Comp. Ambrosiaster, Augustine, *contr. Parm.* iii. 2 ; Pelagius, Anselm.

³ The expression : ὄλεθρ. τ. σαρκ., is too strong and characteristic to allow of its

being understood merely of the *pains of repentance* breaking the sinful impulses. The repentance, too, was, in fact, just as likely to have remained lacking as to have set in, had it not been for these *bodily pains* intervening after the delivery over to Satan as a means of humiliation and discipline (comp. ἵνα παιδευθῶσι, 1 Tim. i. 20, and Huther on that verse). Thereby the whole *mortification of the old man* was to be brought about, inasmuch as the σάρξ constitutes the moral essence of the old man in virtue of the power of sin which dwells in it (Rom. vii. 18), and which guides and governs him. The σάρξ is to perish, in order that the δίκη of ὄλεθρος αἰώνιος may not be inflicted at the day of judgment (2 Thess. i. 9 ; comp. 1 Tim. vi. 9).

serve God's aim of salvation. — *ἵνα τὸ πνεῦμα κ.τ.λ.*] in order that his spirit, the underlying element of the higher moral life, of the true *ζωή*, may be saved (with the Messianic salvation) on the day of the (approaching) Parousia. That the *σῶμα*, again,—in which the *σάρξ* has lost its life, so that it is no longer the *σῶμα τῆς σαρκός*, Col. ii. 11,—should then be glorified, was a thing which did not need to be expressly stated to the Christian eschatological consciousness. See so early an expositor as Chrysostom. Calovius puts it well: “Non ergo dividit hominem apostolus, quasi eum partim interire, partim servari velit. Nam nec corpus interire potest sine divulsione ab anima, nec anima servari absque corporis salute.” Now this Messianic salvation was to Paul's mind not merely a possible thing (Olshausen), but he expected it as a result, which, in virtue of the saving power of Christ, could not fail to ensue after the slaying of the sinful impulses by the *ὀλεθρος τῆς σαρκός* in the case of the man led by this punishment to conviction of sin and true penitence. The *παρὰδοῦναι τῷ Σατ.* was therefore a *paedagogic* penal arrangement, a “*medicinale remedium*” (Calovius), as is shown by the whole scope of this passage and 1 Tim. i. 20 (not by the term *παρὰδοῦναι* itself, as Chrysostom, Theodoret, and Theophylact maintain, on the ground of Paul's not having written *ἐκδοῦναι*),—a measure, in connection with which the *πνεῦμα* remained out of Satan's power and accessible to the gracious influences of Christ, inasmuch as it retained the vital principle of faith, which was to develop its supremacy just in proportion as the *σάρξ* was destroyed. This may suffice to set aside Rückert's censure of the apostle's proceeding, on the ground that the punishment might easily have led to the utter destruction of the sinner, and, moreover, that Paul acted “*imprudently*” (comp. Baur, I. p. 335 f., 2d ed.), since he could not have compelled the Corinthians to obey him in the matter. He does not, in fact, actually ordain¹ the *παρὰδοῦναι τῷ Σατ.*, but says merely that he, for his part, has already resolved on this, confining himself, therefore, certainly (against Lipsius and Hofmann) to the threat² in the meantime; and what he desires for the present is just the simple *αἶρειν ἐκ μέσου* (comp. ver. 13), which also was done by the majority, as we learn from 2 Cor. ii. 6, and that with the best results! Comp. Bengel on ver. 3. Upon the whole, too, we may believe that Paul knew his own powers of apostolic discipline, and may trust him to have been satisfied that, to try milder measures first (the omission of which Rückert blames as arising from passion), would not with the person concerned have had the effect aimed at. (M)

Ver. 6. In face of the necessity for such measures as these—*how odious appears that of which ye make boast!* Rather ought ye to consider that a little leaven, etc., and (ver. 7) sweep out the old leaven! *Καύχημα* is not the same as *καύχησις*, but: *matèries gloriandi* (see on Rom. iv. 2); and what is meant

¹ Baur, however, is of opinion (*Paulus*, I. p. 334) that as it never did come in the instance before us to the working of an actual apostolic miracle, so neither did such a thing ever take place in any other case. See, on the other hand, Rom. xv. 19; 2

Cor. xii. 12; 1 Cor. xii. 10, 29 f.

² Hence, too, the idea that the readers were to let him know of the day fixed for the meeting in question (Hofmann), is not conveyed in the passage, and is, indeed, quite alien to its scope.

by it is not the incestuous person (Chrysostom, Theophylact, Grotius) as a man of high repute for wisdom in Corinth, but the condition of the Corinthians as a Christian church, inasmuch as they boasted themselves of this so confidently, while morally it was foul enough and full of shameful abuses! *αἰσχρὸν κλέος*, Eur. *Hel.* 135. — οὐκ οἶδατε κ.τ.λ.] Basis of the admonition which follows in ver. 7. The *meaning of the proverbial saying* (comp. Gal. v. 9, and on the figure of the leaven, which is very frequently used elsewhere, and that in different senses, Matt. xiii. 33 ; Luke xiii. 21 ; Matt. xvi. 6 ; Mark viii. 15 ; Luke xii. 1) is *ordinarily* defined to be this : *that a corrupt man corrupts the whole church*. But ver. 8 proves that Paul was thinking not of persons, but of abstract qualities in connection with ζύμη and ἄζυμα. The meaning, therefore, must be : Know ye not *that one scandal in the church robs the whole church* of its moral and Christian character ? Comp. also Hofmann. In virtue of their relation as members of a common society, all become chargeable with guilt by the toleration among them of a single scandalous offence, and their ἀγιότης is gone !

Ver. 7. Ἐκκαθάρατε τὴν παλ. ζύμη] From what has been already said, the *meaning apart from the figure* cannot, it is plain, be : *Exclude from your communion the incestuous person*¹ and other notorious offenders (Rosenmüller), but : *Empty your church of the sinful habits, which still remain among you from your pre-Christian condition* (as a residuum of the unregenerate παλαιὸς ἄνθρωπος, Rom. vi. 6 ; Eph. iv. 22 ; Col. iii. 9).² Flatt, Pott, and Rückert join the two ideas together ; but this is unwarranted and against the unity of sense of the passage. Respecting τὴν παλαιάν, comp. Ignatius, *Magnes.* 10 : τὴν κακὴν ζύμην τὴν παλαιωθείσαν καὶ ἐνοξίσασαν. — The expression ἐκκαθάρα. (comp. Plato, *Euth.* p. 3 A ; LXX. Deut. xxvi. 13) is *selected* in view of the custom, based on Ex. xii. 15 ff., xiii. 7, and very strictly observed among the Jews, of removing all leaven from the houses on the day before the Passover (see as to this, Schoettgen, *Hor.* p. 598 ; Lund, *Jüd. Heiligth.*, ed. Wolf, p. 1111 f.), which was meant to be a sign of the moral purification of the house (Ewald, *Alterth.* p. 475 f.). — νέον φύραμα] *a fresh kneaded mass, i.e.* figure apart : *a morally new church*, freshly restored after the separation from it of all immoral fermenting elements, its members being νέοι ἄνθρωποι through Christ (Col. iii. 9, 10). As respects the difference between νέος and καινός, see on Col. iii. 10. — καθὼς ἐστε ἄζυμοι] *in accordance with your unleavened character, i.e.* in keeping with the ethical nature of the position of a Christian, which, as such, is separated from sin. For this ἄζυμον εἶναι is *the essential characteristic in the Christian*,—who is, it is taken for granted, reconciled to God, born again, spiritually dead and risen again with Christ (Rom. vi. 2 ff.), and who as a new κτίσις of God (2 Cor. v. 17 ; Eph. iv. 24 ; Col. iii. 10) in the καινότης πνεύματος (Rom. vii. 6) is free from the law of sin and death (Rom. viii. 2), and constantly developing the powers of a divine life towards perfect holiness (vi. 11 ; 2 Cor. vi. 14 ff.), being alive unto God as His child in whom Christ lives (Gal. ii. 19, 20)—and sin in such an one (the

¹ Chrysostom, Theophylact, Cornelius à Lapide, Zeger, Estius, Michaelis.

² Comp. Theodoret, Calvin, de Wette,

Osiander, Ewald, Maier, Neander, Hofmann.

being leavened) is abnormal. Hence Christians *are*—according to this higher mode of regarding the position of a Christian—*ἄζυμοι*. There is as little warrant for rendering *ἐστέ* here by *esse debetis* (Flatt, Pott, Billroth, following Chrysostom, Theophylact, *al.*) as in Luke ix. 55. Rosenmüller holds that *ἄζυμ.* has here its *proper* meaning : as ye now “*vivitis festos dies azymorum.*” But *ἄζυμος*, in fact, does not mean *qui abstinet fermento* (as Grotius would make out, likening it to *ἄσιτος*, *ἄοινος*), but *non fermentatus* (comp. מֵצוּיִת). Plato, *Tim.* p. 74 D ; Athen. iii. p. 109 B ; Gen. xix. 3 ; Ezek. xxix. 2, *al.* Moreover, Paul could not address these words in that proper meaning *to the church as a whole*, even if the Jewish-Christians among them still kept the Jewish Passover. — καὶ γὰρ τὸ πάσχα κ.τ.λ.] The motive for ἐκκαθάρατε κ.τ.λ. The emphasis is on τὸ πάσχα,¹ and καὶ γάρ does not mean simply *for*, *etenim*, but *for also* (Hartung, *Partikell.* I. p. 137 f.; Stallbaum, *ad Plat. Gorg.* p. 467 B), the “*also*” introducing the objective relation of things corresponding to the exhortation which had just been given. The paschal lamb slain, and the leaven not purged out—what a contradiction that is ! Paul designates Christ as the Christians’ *paschal lamb* which had been *slain* (Deut. xvi. 6 ; Mark xiv. 12 ; Luke xxii. 7), because He is the antitype of the Passover lamb under the law, inasmuch, namely, as His blood was shed, not by any means merely “*as the beginning of redemption which made it possible*” (Hofmann, *Schriftbeweis*, II. 1, p. 323), but, according to the whole N. T., *as the atonement* for believers, and that, too, on the very same day (the day before the feast of the Passover, see on John xviii. 28) on which, from the earliest times, the blood of the paschal lambs had been shed as an expiation for each family (see Ewald, *Alterth.* p. 466 f. ; Keil, § lxxxi. 11). Comp. also John xix. 36. In connection with this verse it has been justly remarked (comp. on John xviii. 28, and Lücke in the *Gött. gel. Anz.* 1834, p. 2020), that Paul could not with propriety have given this title to Christ, if he had followed the Synoptical account of the day of Jesus’ death. Comp. *Introduct. to John*, § 2. In point of fact, had he followed the tradition of the Synoptists, that death-day, as being the 15th Nisan, would, by the mode of conception necessarily arising from his Jewish nationality, have hindered his calling Christ antitypically the slain paschal lamb. For a Passover lamb slain on the first day of the feast would have been, to a Jewish mind moulded according to the ancient and venerated appointment of the divine law, a “*contradictio in adjecto* ;”² even supposing that the point of the comparison—which, in accordance with the invariable Pauline mode of regarding the death of Jesus (comp. also on John i. 29), must of necessity

¹ Theodoret renders wrongly, for it is against the order of the words (as if it were καὶ γὰρ ἡμῶν τ. π.) : ἔχομεν καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀμνὸν τὴν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἱερουργίαν καταδεξάμενον ; comp. Luther and Neander. Erasmus translates correctly : “*Nam et pascha nostrum.*”

² This passage, too, therefore goes to establish the position that *John’s* narrative, and not the *Synoptic*, is the historically correct one as regards the day of the death of Jesus. Observe how the Rabbinical tradi-

tion also agrees with this. See Gemara Bab. in *Sanhedr.* vi. 2 : “*Traditio est, vesp̄ra Paschat̄is suspensum fuisse Jesum.*” It is well known that the 14th Nisan (the Preparation-day) was called פסחָ עֶרֶב, *vesp̄ra Paschat̄is*. The fabulous circumstances linked with the death of Jesus itself in the passage of the Talmud referred to, do not affect the simple statement as to the time when it took place.

be His *being slain as a ἱλαστήριον*, Rom. iii. 25—were the *new divine polity* of the holy people, to which the death of Jesus stands, it is said, just in the same relation as the slaying of the paschal lamb in Egypt to the deliverance of Israel out of Egypt (as Hofmann objects). Wieseler, in his *chronol. Synopse*, p. 374 f. (comp. also his *Beitr. z. Würdigung d. Ev.* p. 266), urges as an argument on the other side, that in x. 16, τὸ ποτήριον τῆς εὐλογίας, as a technical phrase for the cup in the Lord's Supper, shows that this cup was identified with that of the Passover. Assuredly ! but it shows also, in necessary connection therewith, that Christ slain on the 14th Nisan was the *Paschal Lamb* of believers. The Supper, therefore, which brought them into fellowship with the body and blood of Christ, could not but present itself to the Christian consciousness as the paschal *meal*, corresponding to the eating of the paschal lamb, and so, too, the *cup* in the Supper as the antitype of the paschal cup. Consequently chap. x. 16, taken in connection with the passage before us, speaks *for* and not *against* the account in John. It is, however, from the view held by the primitive church respecting the Supper as the antitype of the paschal meal, that the origin of the Synoptical tradition is to be historically understood. See on John xviii. 28.

Ver. 8. The paschal lamb having been slain, there follows the *keeping of the feast*, and that not with leaven, but with what is unleavened. Since, then, Christ has been slain as the Christian's paschal lamb, they too must keep their feast in an ethical sense, that is to say, by leading a holy life, without sinful admixture; with pure and true Christian virtue. Hence the admonition : *let us therefore keep feast*, etc. The εορτή implied in εορτάζ. is, it is true, the *feast of the Passover*, but in such a sense that the keeping of the Passover is meant to be a figurative representation of the character of the whole of a *Christian's walk and conversation*, because this is to be without moral leaven, etc. Comp. Philo, *de congr. er. qu. gr.* p. 447 D. It may be added, that Theodore of Mopsuestia says aptly : ὡς γὰρ παρὼν, οὕτω πρὸς τοὺς παρόντας λοιπὸν διαλέγεται. — ἐν ζύμῃ παλ.] Precisely as in ver. 7 ; not as a designation of the incestuous person (Michaelis, Rosenmüller, Heydenreich), which would, besides, have required the article. Ἐν is used in the sense of *provided with*. Comp. on iv. 21. — μηδὲ ἐν ζύμῃ κακ. κ. πον.] singles out something special from the general μὴ ἐν ζ. παλ. : *and in particular not with the leaven of maliciousness and wickedness* (see on Rom. i. 29). The genitives are genitives *appositionis*. The apostle must have had ground enough in the condition of the church, even apart from the case of the incestuous man, for laying such peculiar stress in the way of warning upon *nequitia* and *malitia*. — ἀζύμοις] from ἄζυμα, *what is unleavened*, i.e. מצות (Ex. xii. 15, 18). There is nothing (such as ἄρτοις) that needs to be supplied. — Εἰλικριν. and ἀληθ. differ from each other only in degree ; the former is moral *purity* (καθαρότης διανοίας καὶ ἀδολόγητος οὐδὲν ἔχουσαι συννεσιασμένον καὶ ὑπουργον, Theophylact on 2 Cor. i. 12) ; the latter, moral *truth*, the essence of actual moral goodness. See on John iii. 21 ; Eph. v. 9 ; Phil. iv. 8.

REMARK.—This whole allegory, vv. 6–8, would have been unnatural on Paul's part, had he been writing this Epistle, which was written before Pentecost

(xvi. 8), *after* Easter, and so *between* that feast and Pentecost,—extremely natural, on the other hand, if the Jewish Passover was then in immediate prospect. Were that the case, this very allegory, *which is taken up by him in no other place*, would offer itself to him unsought, so that the peculiar stamp of his discourse would be accounted for as bearing the impress of the festal thoughts awakened within him by the approach of the Passover. The passage before us, therefore, compared with xvi. 8, is rightly regarded by Bengel and most of the succeeding commentators (comp. especially Wieseler, *Chronologie d. Apost. Zeitalt.* p. 327 ff.) as giving evidence of the fact that Paul was now writing shortly before Easter. The few expositors who oppose this view (Henke on Paley's *Hor. Paul.* p. 413 ff. ; Eichhorn, *Einkl.* III. p. 138 ; de Wette, Curtius, *de temp. quo prior P. ad Tim.*, etc. p. 43 ; Schrader, II. p. 132 ; Hofmann) have only this in their favour, that a demonstrative proof is of course impossible. But it is a misunderstanding of the passage to find in it an admonition to celebrate properly the *approaching feast of Easter* (see especially Heydenreich). Considering the *figurative* nature of the expression (see on ver. 8), we must not try to draw any inferences from this passage as to the question *whether* or *how* Christians kept the feast of Easter in those days (against Weitzel, *Passahf.* p. 183 ff. ; Lechler, p. 350). Theophylact says well : δείκνυσιν ὅτι πᾶς ὁ χρόνος ἑορτῆς ἐστὶ καιρὸς τοῖς Χριστιανοῖς διὰ τὴν ὑπερβολὴν τῶν δοθέντων αὐτοῖς ἀγαθῶν· διὰ τοῦτο γὰρ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ ἄνθρωπος γέγονε καὶ ἐτόθῃ, ἵνα σε ἑορτάζειν ποιήσῃ. Comp. Hilgenfeld, *Paschastreit*, p. 173 f.

Vv. 9–13. *Citation and fuller explanation of a passage of the former letter which had been misinterpreted in Corinth by his malevolent adversaries.* The new section begins without a connective particle, like vi. 1, v. 1.

Ver. 9. *Sequence of thought* : What I have written to you thus far concerning the exclusion of the incestuous person, and concerning the purging out of the leaven, leads me now to speak of the passage in my former letter which has been misunderstood among you, etc. — ἐν τῇ ἐπιστολῇ] *i.e.* in the letter which I wrote to you, and so : in my letter, by which Paul means the letter to the Corinthians, composed before the present one and in the possession of his readers, but not in ours. So rightly Ambrosiaster, and after him Calvin, Beza, Estius, Clarius, Zeger, Grotius, Calovius, Bengel, Wetstein, Mosheim, Semler, and many others, including most modern interpreters. Chrysostom, again, Theodoret, Theophylact, Erasmus, Cornelius à Lapide, Fabricius, Wolf, Glass, Baumgarten, Bolten, Stosch (*de epp. ap. non deperd.* 1753, p. 75 ff.), and Müller (*de trib. Pauli itinerib. Corinth. suscept. de epistolisque ad eosd. non deperdit.*, Basil. 1831), understand it of the *present Epistle*, either supposing that a reference is intended to vv. 2 and 6, or even making ἔγρ. apply to ver. 11. This method of interpretation arises for the most part from dogmatic prejudices,¹ and has against it the following con-

¹ Grotius aptly remarks : "Satis Deo debemus, quod tot (epistolae) servatae sunt, ad quas si et singulorum vita et regimen ecclesiae dirigatur, bene erit." Comp. Calvin. Calovius, in order to defend the integrity of the canon against the Roman Catholics, insists upon the distinction—

which itself owes its origin to a dogmatic retrospective inference—between *canon particularis* and *universalis*, *temporalis* and *perpetuus*. Divine Providence, he holds, did not design the lost Epistle *ad usum canonici perpetuum* of the whole church, and therefore allowed it to perish.

siderations : *first*, the parallel passage in 2 Cor. vii. 8 ; *secondly*, that ἐν τῇ ἐπ. would in that case be singularly superfluous ; *thirdly*, the fact that μὴ συναναμ. πόρν. occurs neither in ver. 2 nor ver. 6 ; and *finally*, that no occasion at all had been given in the preceding statements for any such misapprehension as is here corrected. Lange, in his *Apostol. Zeitalter*, I. p. 205, pronounces in a peculiarly positive way that the hypothesis of a lost Epistle is a "*fiction*;" Paul means the present letter, but distinguishes it *as a letter* from the *ecstatic act* which he had just performed through the medium of this letter, namely, the transference of himself in spirit into the midst of the church ; what he wishes to declare is the *permanent epistolary significance* of that act. But this itself is quite an empty "*fiction*," since there is not a trace of an ecstasy here, since Paul would, on this theory, have taken the very vaguest way possible of expressing his supposed meaning, and since the parallel statement in 2 Cor. vii. 8 is decisively against any such arbitrary fancies. (N) It may be added that, when Rückert holds that the article here, and the absence of any defining adjective, prove the lost Epistle to have been the only one which Paul had then already sent to Corinth, this, on a comparison with 2 Cor. vii. 8, appears to be an over-hasty conclusion, although, so far as the fact itself is concerned, it may be regarded as correct, seeing that we have no hint of any other lost letter having also preceded our first Epistle. — συναναμικν.] *to mix oneself up with, have intercourse with*, 2 Thess. iii. 14 ; Athen. vi. p. 256 Α ; Lucian. *Cont.* xv. Comp. the affirmative στέλλεσθαι ἀπό, 2 Thess. iii. 6. — πόρνος, in the N. T. and in Ecclus. xxiii. 16, signifies *fornicator*.¹ See also Lennep. *Phalar. ep.* xi. p. 60. 2.

Ver. 10. More precise negative explanation of the rule laid down in the said letter, μὴ συναναμ. πόρν., which had been misinterpreted among the Corinthians (as Paul gathered probably from their letter to him) into a prohibition of association with fornicators *among those who were not Christians* ; perhaps from a disposition to connive at the offenders within the bosom of the church itself. — οὐ πάντως τοῖς πόρν. τ. κ. τ.] is dependent on μὴ συναναμικν. ; it stands in a relation of *opposition* to the preceding πόρνοις, and explains what that πόρνοις did *not* mean. "I wrote to you to refrain from intercourse *with fornicators*, (i.e.) *not absolutely*² *with the fornicators of this world*." An entire cessation of intercourse with πόρνοις in that sense of the word, it would, of course, be impossible to establish, seeing that you cannot go out of the world ; but what I meant was *Christians* given to fornication, ver. 11. Comp. Plato, *Pol.* v. p. 454 C : οὐ πάντως τὴν αὐτὴν κ. τὴν ἑτέραν φύσιν ἐτιθέμεθα, ἀλλ' ἐκεῖνο τὸ εἶδος μόνον κ.τ.λ. The οὐ instead of μὴ is correct enough (in opposition to Rückert), because οὐ πάντως τ. πόρν. τ. κ. τ. conveys something which is *objectively* denied, a definition of the notion of πόρνοις, which *does not occur*. Comp. Buttmann, *neut. Gr.* p. 334 [E. T. 389]. The conception is a different one, e.g., in Plato, *Pol.* iv. p. 419 A : εἰάν τις σε φῇ μὴ πάνυ τι εὐδαίμονας ποιεῖν τούτους. Commentators often supply

¹ In the classics, mostly of *unnatural* vice (with males). Becker, *Charides*, I. p. 346 ff. ; Hermann, *Privatalterth.* § xxix. 22.

² The phrase πάντη πάντως, which is com-

mon with Greek writers (Lobeck, *Paral.* p. 57), would have been still stronger if used in place of πάντως, *altogether, absolutely*. See generally on ix. 22.

ἔγραψα after οὐ ; so, among the rest, Olshausen ; *not (wrote I, meant I) : with the fornicators of this world in general*. But what an arbitrary separation this is of the mutually connected words οὐ πάντως ! And the interpretation in question has this, too, against it, that τ. κόσμον τ. does not refer to the world in general, but to those who were non-Christians (see below), so that the “*in general*” would be *logically* incorrect. Rückert takes οὐ πάντως as an intensified negative like that in Rom. iii. 9 (comp. Luther), and supplies ἔγραψα after it : “*By no means did I write ; i.e., the import of my prohibition was by no means, to have no intercourse with the fornicators of this world.*” But so understood, the words would lend countenance to intercourse with fornicators not Christian, which cannot be Paul’s meaning. His intention is merely to set aside the misinterpretation which had been put upon his words, as if he had meant thereby to enforce an absolute cessation of intercourse with unchaste men outside the Christian society. Lastly, Billroth is wrong in rendering, after Chrysostom and Theophylact (τὸ πάντως ὡς ἐπὶ ὁμολογημένου τέθεικε πράγματος) : “*not, of course, with the fornicators of this world.*” In that case, we should have had at least πάντως οὐ, for the sense would be, as Theophylact himself states : καὶ πάντως οὐ τοῖς πόρνοις τ. κόσμον συναναμίγνυσθαι ἐκώλυσεν, τουτέστι τοῖς τῶν Ἑλλήνων. — τοῦ κόσμου τούτου] *who belong to this (ante-Messianic) world*, not, like the Christians, to the Messiah’s kingdom as its future members ; hence it is the ἀλλότριον τῆς πίστεως (Theodoret) who are here denoted, whose opposite is the ἀδελφός in ver. 11. To understand it of *mankind in general*, Christians and non-Christians together (Pott, Hofmann, *al.*), is, seeing that τούτου is joined with it, contrary to the apostle’s mode of using language (Gal. iv. 3 ; Col. ii. 8 ; Eph. ii. 2 ; 1 Cor. iii. 19, vii. 31 ; 2 Cor. iv. 4), and contrary also to the context (vv. 11, 12). Afterwards, when Paul is thinking of the world of men *in general*, he purposely omits the τούτου. — ἢ τοῖς πλεονέκταις κ.τ.λ.] We may suppose that Paul, in the passage of his former letter now alluded to, had warned them not merely against πόρνοις, but also against those guilty of the other kinds of vice indicated here, and yet more specifically in ver. 11. Hence : “*with the fornicators of this world, or—not to overlook the others, with whom also I forbade you to hold intercourse—with those greedy of gain, and violently grasping at it.*” These two, connected with each other as general, and particular by καί (see the critical remarks), are conceived of as *belonging together* to one category. It is otherwise in ver. 11, where each of these sins is viewed by itself. As to ἄρπ., the essential characteristic of which is *violence*, comp. Luke xviii. 11 ; Soph. *Phil.* 640 : κλέψαι τε χάρπάσαι βία. — Τ. κόσμον τ. is to be understood again after ἄρπ. and εἰδωλ. See ver. 11. — ἐπεὶ ὀφείλετε κ.τ.λ.] *for so, (were you absolutely and entirely to break off from the heathen fornicators, etc.) you must needs go out of the world* (ἐτέραν οἰκουμένην ὀφείλετε ζητῆσαι, Theophylact), since nowhere could you be perfectly relieved from casual contact with such non-Christians. I should thus have demanded what was impossible. As regards the direct ὀφείλετε, comp. vii. 14 ; Rom. iii. 6, xi. 6, 22. It is attested by B, Chrysostom, and Theodoret. In place of it, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Rückert, and Hofmann read ὠφείλετε, which has, indeed, the preponderance

of evidence in its favour, but must be considered as an emendation. The *strangeness* of the conclusion is not conveyed by the *ἄρα* (Hofmann, following the mistake of Hartung), but by the case itself assumed, in which the *ἄρα* merely introduces what was indubitably involved in the supposed protasis (comp. Baumelein, *Partik.* p. 19 ff.). See against Hartung, Ellendt, *Lex. Soph.* I. p. 214.

Ver. 11. *Νυνὶ δέ*] *But thus* (see on Rom. iii. 21), in reality as contrasted with the aforesaid misconstruction, *I did write to you*. Herewith Paul now introduces the *true* meaning of the passage from his letter quoted above, ver. 9. Other expositors make *νυνὶ δέ* refer to *time*: *but at present* (Cajetan, Morus, Pott, Heydenreich). But the whole context is against this; according to it, Paul's design is simply to define more precisely the purport of that phrase in his former letters: "*μὴ συναναμίγνυσθαι πόρνοις.*" He has done this only *negatively* in ver. 10, but goes on now to do it *positively* in ver. 11. Further, were a contrast drawn between the present and the former letter, the *present* *γράφω* would have been more natural and more distinct than the epistolary *aorist* (see on Gal. vi. 11); nay, to obviate the misunderstanding, it would have been a thing of necessity, iv. 14. — *ἀδελφὸς ὀνομαζόμεν.*] the most important element in the more definite explanation¹ which Paul is giving of his misunderstood prohibition: *being called a brother*, i.e. bearing the name of Christian. Comp. *ὄνομα ἔχειν*, Rev. iii. 1. Estius, following Ambrosiaster, Augustine, and Oecumenius, joins *ὀνομαζ.* with what comes after, in the sense of: *if a brother is a notorious fornicator*, having the name of being such. But *ὀνομάζεσθαι* means always simply *to be called*, without any such pregnancy of significance either in a good or bad sense (even in Eph. i. 21, v. 3; Rom. xv. 20). Had Paul wished to express the meaning of: *bearing the character and repute of a fornicator*, he must have used the phrase *ὀνομάζεσθαι εἶναι πόρνος* (Plato, *Pol.* iv. p. 428 E; *Prot.* p. 311 E). Besides, it is unlikely that he should have expressly limited the prohibition to *notorious* fornicators alone, and thereby weakened its moral force. — *λοιδόρος*] as in vi. 10; comp. on iv. 12. — *εἰδωλολάτρης*] Estius observes well that this applies to *the* Christian, who "sive ex animo, seu metu, seu placendi voluntate, seu quavis alia ratione inductus, infidelium sacris se admiscet, ut vel idolum colat, opere saltem externo, vel de idolothytis edat." Comp. vi. 9, viii. 10, x. 7, xiv. 1; John v. 21; and Düsterdieck *in loc.* Among the frivolous Corinthians, such reversions to the old habits and fellowship might not be uncommon. — *μέθυσος*] used by old writers only of the female sex; but of the male also in later Greek, after Menander. See Wetstein; Lobeck, *ad Phryn.* p. 151 f.; Meineke, *Menander*, p. 27. — There are no traces discernible of a logical order in the *series* of vices here enumerated beyond this, that the three which are of specifically *heathen* character are put first, and then three others follow, which

¹ This more detailed definition, therefore, cannot have been given expressly in the lost Epistle, but must have been taken for granted as self-evident. Otherwise they could not have so misinterpreted the *συνα-*

ναμίγ. πόρνοις as they had actually done. For there is no indication in the text that the misinterpretation was a *wilful and malicious* one, arising out of *κακία κ. πονηρία*, ver. 8 (Hofmann).

destroy the peace of the *church-life*. — τῷ τ. μὴδὲ συνεσθ.] parallel, though by way of climax, to the μὴ συναναμ. ; hence not anacoluthic in point of construction. As regards the meaning, again, we must not limit it to the *Agapae* (Vorstius, Mosheim, Stolz, Heydenreich), which would suit neither the quite general phrase συνεσθ. (comp. xi. 20) nor the intensifying μὴδέ. It means : *with one so constituted* (comp. ver. 5) *not even to have fellowship at table* (neither to ask him to your table, nor sit with him at his). Comp. Luke xv. 2 ; Gal. ii. 12. This implies of course of itself, that they ought also to have no fellowship at the *Agapae* with such persons. Εἰ δὲ κοινῆς τροφῆς τοῖς τοιοῦτοις οὐ δεῖ κοινωνεῖν, ἥπου γε μυστικῆς τε καὶ θείας, Theodoret. Respecting the distinction between the μὴ συναναμίγν. and excommunication, see 2 Thess. iii. 15.

Ver. 12 f. The reason for his having spoken in reference to the Christians, and not those without the Christian pale : *for it does not at all concern me to be passing disciplinary judgments upon the latter*. — τὶ γάρ μοι] *for what concern is it of mine?* etc. See Wetstein on the passage, and Schaefer, *ad Bos. Ell.* p. 598. The emphasis falls so entirely upon τί and τοὺς ἔξω, that we have not ἐμοί, which is not needed even if the reading καὶ (even, besides) τ. ἔξω be adopted. — τοὺς ἔξω] was with the Jews the standing name (חִיצוֹנִים) for the heathen (see Lightfoot, *Hor.*, *ad Marc.* iv. 11 ; Schoettgen on this verse ; Kypke, II. p. 198) ; and so, in like manner, with the Christians it was the standing appellation for all who were *non-Christians*, as being outside the fellowship of the true people of God (Col. iv. 5 ; 1 Thess. iv. 12 ; 1 Tim. iii. 7). — οὐχὶ τοὺς ἔσω ὑμεῖς κρίνετε ;] By this question Paul appeals, in justification of what he has just said : “what does it concern me,” etc., *to the exercise of judicial functions by his readers themselves* in the administration of church discipline, in so far, that is to say, as that discipline bore upon their *fellow-Christians*, and not upon those outside of the Christian society. Rückert thinks that Paul means to say : *Judging is not my matter at all* (seeing that the members of the church were judged by their fellow-members themselves ; while those without, again, God would hereafter judge). But judging was doubtless his matter (see vv. 4–6, vv. 11, 13), only not respecting those ἔξω. What he means is rather this : “To judge those who are *not Christians* is no concern of mine, any more than *you* take in hand to judge any others except your *fellow-believers*.” “Ex eo, quod in ecclesia fieri solet, interpretari debuistis monitum meum, ver. 9 : cives judicatis, non alienos,” Bengel. The simple κρίνετε is altered in meaning by Billroth : *Is it not enough that ye?* etc., as well as by Castalio, Grotius, *al.* : *judicare debetis* (we find this interpretation as early as Theophylact). The Corinthians *actually judged*, every time that they passed a sentence of ecclesiastical discipline. Lastly, it is a mistake to render, as is done by τινές in Theophylact, Knatchbull, Hammond, Michaelis, Semler, Rosenmüller, Flatt, Heydenreich : *No ; judge ye your fellow-Christians!* Οὐχί is not a suitable answer to τί, and would, besides, require ἀλλά after it (Rom. iii. 27 ; Luke i. 60, xii. 51, xiii. 3, 5, xvi. 30), and that with a clause forming a logically correct antithesis to the question put.

Ver. 13. *But of those that are without God is judge*,—not I and not you.

This statement appears more weighty and striking when taken as a sentence by itself, than as a continuation of the question (and still in dependence upon οὐχί ; so Lachmann, Rückert, Olshausen, Hofmann). The accentuation κρινεῖ¹ is to be rejected, because it is clear from the context, that so far from there being any necessity for the reference to the last judgment which would give occasion for the *future* (Rom. iii. 6, ii. 16), on the contrary the present κρίνει (Erasmus, Castalio, Beza, Calvin, *al.*, Pott, de Wette) corresponds in much the most natural way to the preceding κρίνειν and κρίνετε. According to this view, then, the future judgment is neither exclusively pointed to by κρίνει, nor is it thereby excluded ; but the judgment of those who are non-Christians is described *generally as a matter for God*, whenever and however it may take place. — Paul has now ended his more definite explanation and correction as regards that misunderstood statement in his letter, ver. 9. But for the Corinthians what more direct inference could be drawn from this explanation, than the duty of expelling the offender already spoken of, whom they should indeed have excluded before (ver. 2) ? Hence the apostle adds, without further preface (note, too, the *aorist*), the brief categorical command : ἐξάρατε κ.τ.λ. This injunction corresponds so exactly to the LXX. version of Deut. xxiv. 7, that it must be set down as simply arbitrary to deny that the form of expression here was purposely selected from remembrance of that passage. Μωσαϊκὴν τέθεικε μαρτυρίαν, θείῳ νόμῳ βεβαιώσας τὸν λόγον, Theodoret. Hofmann conjectures that Paul wrote καὶ ἐξαρεῖ τε, and that this meant : *and no less will He (God) also take away the wicked one* (those who are wicked in general) *from the midst of you ;*” but this is neither critically established—since the *Recepta* καὶ ἐξαρεῖτε is on critical grounds to be utterly rejected—nor grammatically admissible, for the assumed use of καὶ . . . τέ is foreign both to Attic prose and to the N. T. ;² nor, finally, is it in accordance with the context, for τὸν πονηρόν manifestly refers to the specific malefactor of ver. 2, and to his exclusion from church ; comp. Augustine : “τὸν πονηρόν, quod est *hunc* malignum.” — ὑμῶν ἀντῶν] is more expressive than the simple ὑμῶν : *from the midst of yourselves*, in which you have hitherto tolerated him. Bengel’s comment hits the mark : “antitheton *externos*.”

REMARK.—Paul has ended what he had to say against the party-divisions in chap. iv. That the evils censured in chap. v. (and vi.) had any connection in point of principle with the party-divisions, is a view which finds no trace of support in the apostle’s way of speaking of them. Hence, too, it is impossible to prove that the persons at whom Paul’s censures were levelled belonged to

¹ Although preferred by Luther, Grotius, Estius, Wetstein, Bengel, Valckenaer, *al.*, Lachmann, Scholz, Rückert, Olshausen, Tischendorf, Ewald, Hofmann (in accordance with Arm. Copt. Vulgate, Chrysostom, *al.*).

² The apparent proof - passages from Greek writers are either founded on corrupt readings or are deprived of their force when correctly explained. See especially

Bornemann, *ad Anab.* i. 8. 3 ; Kühner, *ad Memor.* iv. 2. 28 ; Hartung, *Partikell.* I. p. 113 ff. ; also Krüger on *Thuc.* i. 9. 3. The *atque etiam* would have been rendered by καὶ . . . δέ. With respect to the occurrence of καὶ τε and καὶ . . . τε, without a corresponding καὶ after it, in Homer, Herodotus, etc., see Nägelsbach on the *Iliad*, p. 176 f., ed. 3 ; and on the whole subject, comp. Matthiae, § 626, p. 1504 f.

any one special party, and if so, to which. In particular, we must refrain from attempting to refer the *πορνεία* in question, and its odious manifestation, to one definite party, and to the principles held by it, whether to the *Pauline* section (Neander), or the *Christ-party* (Olshausen, Jaeger, Kniewel), or the *Apollonians* (Räbiger). This much only may be regarded as certain, that the misuse of Christian freedom, so far as that *in principle* lay at the root of the mischief (vi. 12), cannot be charged upon the *Petrine* party.

NOTES BY AMERICAN EDITOR.

(M) *Church discipline.* Ver. 5.

The case mentioned here is of importance as settling once for all the duty, the limits, and the object of ecclesiastical discipline. Disorderly conduct is not to be left simply to the action of the ordinary influence of Christian teaching, but must be dealt with directly by the church in the way of judicial inquiry. Immorality is not to be tolerated among the avowed followers of Christ. This, however, does not involve the infliction of temporal pains and penalties. Nothing of this kind is even hinted at in the account of the treatment of the incestuous man. Christ's kingdom is not of this world, and neither requires nor admits of the secular arm to enforce its decisions. Its whole action is moral and spiritual, and the extremest infliction it can impose in any case is exclusion from its fellowship. The reasons for exercising such discipline are—first, the honour of Christ, which is sadly impeached when open sin is allowed among those who confess His name. To make “Christ the minister of sin” is a grievous offence. Secondly, the welfare of the church requires that transgressors should be dealt with. For sin is a spreading leprosy. It may begin in a small and obscure place, but unless arrested will increase and diffuse itself till the whole body is infected. A moral gangrene must be cut out. Thirdly, the welfare of the offender himself, which, although it is subordinate to the other considerations mentioned, is never to be lost sight of. The wise, kindly, deliberate action of the church may save the erring member. And hence, however summary the exclusion, the door is always left open for return. No act of excommunication is irrevocable. Its object, so far as the offender is concerned, is his recovery, and if he repent and come to a better mind, nothing stands in the way of his readmission to the privileges of Christ's house.

It is obvious, however, that it was the second of these considerations that the Apostle had in mind, as he adds, “A little leaven leaveneth the whole lump.” This does not mean simply that one scandal robs the whole church of its Christian character, but rather suggests the spreading nature of sin alike in individuals and communities. A single cherished sin, however secret, diffuses its corrupting influence over the whole soul; it depraves the conscience; it indurates the moral sensibilities; it cuts off from prayer or renders it formal and empty; it paralyzes the usual means of grace; and it opens the door for other forms of evil. And all this holds good of a society as well as of a single believer. The only safe rule is to resist at the beginning, and continuously to purge out the old leaven, and to make the whole life one of perpetual consecration to God.

(N) *Lost epistles.* Ver. 9.

The majority of interpreters agree with Meyer, that the Apostle here refers to a former epistle which has not been preserved. Some object to this, because they think it would imply that we have an imperfect Bible. But this conclusion by no means follows. Nothing is more natural than to suppose that the Apostles wrote many letters, designed simply to serve some local or temporary purpose, and not intended to serve as part of the rule of faith and conduct for all ages. If so, it was of no consequence whether such writings were preserved or not. It seems certain that the church has all the inspired epistles which God designed she should have. Nothing that ever was justly in the Canon has been lost from it, so far as any evidence on the subject can be gathered from the records of the early church.

CHAPTER VI.

Ver. 2. ἡ] is wanting in Elz., but has decisive evidence in its favour. — Ver. 5. λέγω] Lachm. has λαλῶ, on the authority of Balone. In the absence of internal grounds for decision, this is too weakly attested, far weaker than in xv. 34. — ἐνι] so Griesb. Lachm. Scholz, Rück. Tisch., following B C L S, min. Chrys. Theodoret, *al.* How easily the familiar ἐστίν (so Elz.) would creep in! — σοφὸς οὐδὲ εἰς] Lachm. and Rück. read οὐδεὶς σοφός, with B C S, min. Copt. Damasc. D* E, Clar. Germ. Aeth. Athan. have simply σοφός; F and G have οὐδὲ εἰς σοφός. In A, the whole passage vv. 3–6 is wanting (from the similarity of the two last syllables ἰστων in vv. 2 and 6). From this it appears that the evidence for οὐδεὶς σοφός certainly preponderates, against which, however, there must be set the difficulty of seeing why this reading should have undergone alteration. Were σοφός οὐδὲ εἰς, on the other hand, the original reading (D*** L, most of the min. Vulg., both Syr. Ar. p. and the majority of the Fathers), we have in the first place a very natural explanation of the omission of οὐδὲ εἰς (which Griesb. approves of), inasmuch as copyists went right on from σοφΟΣ to ΟΣ, and the two other variations would then arise from dissimilar critical restorations of the text. — Ver. 7. Elz. has ἐν ὑμῖν against decisive evidence. An interpretation. — Ver. 8. καὶ ταῦτα] Lachm. Rück. and Tisch. have καὶ τοῦτο, following A B C D E S, min. vss. and Fathers. Rightly; the plural crept in, because *two things* were mentioned¹ (ἁδικ. and ἀποστ.). — Ver. 9. There is conclusive evidence for reading Θεοῦ βασ. in place of βασ. Θεοῦ. In ver. 10, again, this order is too weakly attested to be received. — Ver. 10. The οὐ before κληρ. is wanting in A B C D E S, min. Copt. Ignat. Method. Athan. Chrys. *al.* Deleted by Lachm. and Rück. with justice; for while the preceding Θεοῦ might in itself just as easily lead to the omission as (by repetition of the last syllable) to the insertion of the οὐ, the latter was favoured by ver. 9. — Ver. 14. ἡμᾶς] Elz. has ὑμᾶς, against decisive testimony (perhaps from Rom. viii. 11). — ἐξεγερεῖ] Lachm. and Ewald read ἐξεγείρει, with A D*. B and 67** have ἐξήγειρε. The *Recepta* should be adhered to, with Tisch., following C D*** E K L S, min. Vulg., both Syr. Copt. Aeth. Arr. and many Fathers. The connection makes the future necessary as the correlative of καταργήσει in ver. 13, and the evidence in its favour is preponderant, in view of the divided state of the codd. for the other readings. As to ἐξήγειρε and ἐξεγείρει, the former looks like a mechanical repetition of the preceding tense, and the latter a slip of the pen. — ἡ οὐκ (not the simple οὐκ) has decisive evidence on its side. — Ver. 19. τὸ σῶμα] Matth. and Tisch.¹ read τὰ σώματα upon insufficient evidence, part of which is in favour of the plural in ver. 20 also. The alteration to the plural was naturally suggested by the connection. — Ver. 20. καὶ ἐν τῷ πνεύματι ὑμῶν, ἅτινά ἐστι τοῦ Θεοῦ is deleted by all modern editors (except Matth.) since Mill and Griesb., following A B C* D* E F G S, min. Copt. Aeth. Vulg. It. Method. Didym. Cyr. Maxim. Damasc. Tert.

¹ [Tischendorf returns to the singular in his last edition.— T. W. C.]

Cypr. Ir. Ambrosiast. and all the Latin Fathers. An ascetic addition, although a very old one (occurring even in the Syriac), which got into all the wider circulation because a church-lesson begins with *δοξάσατε*. Comp. Reiche, *Comm. crit.* I. p. 165 ff.

Vv. 1–11. *The readers are not to go to law before the heathen* (vv. 1–6) ; and generally, they are, instead of contending with one another, rather to suffer wrong than to do it, bearing in mind that the unrighteous shall not become partakers in the Messianic kingdom (vv. 7–10), and that they, as Christians, have become pure, holy, and righteous (ver. 11).

Ver. 1. A new section, not connected with what has gone before. Paul starts at once with a question of lively surprise : *Dare*¹ any one, etc., and so plunges *in mediam rem*.² The connections of thought, which some have traced out, are arbitrary inventions. This applies not only to Baur's view (in the *theol. Jahrb.* 1852, p. 10 f.),—that it was the damage done to the Christian cause *in public opinion*, both by the immorality discussed in chap. v. and by the lawsuits carried on before the heathen, that led the apostle thus to pass from the one subject to the other,—but also to the connection which Hofmann seeks to establish between this passage and the censure pronounced upon the *insufficient judicial action* taken by the church with its members after the occurrence of the case already adverted to. The judicial proceedings now referred to are plainly of quite *another* kind, not in the way of discipline, but of private lawsuits ; and, moreover, as to former judicial action of the church, not merely was it *insufficient*, but *nothing of the sort* had taken place at all with respect to the *πόρνος*. Paul does not employ so much as a *δέ*, or an *ἀλλά*, or any other form of connection, but goes on with epistolary freedom, leaping, as it were, from one point of censure to another. — *τις*] *any one whatever*. The quite general treatment of the subject which follows shows that no specific individual (Semler) is meant, although it must be left undetermined whether some specially striking case, possibly that of a rich and powerful man (Ewald), may not have given occasion for the apostle's sending these admonitions. — *πᾶγμα*] *lawsuit, matter of dispute*. Comp. Xen. *Mem.* ii. 9. 1 ; Demosth. 1120. 26 ; Josephus, *Antt.* xiv. 10. 7. — *κρίνεσθαι*] *go to law, litigare* ; see on Rom. iii. 4 ; Wetstein, *ad Matth.* v. 40. — *ἐπὶ τῶν ἀδίκων*] *before* (Winer, p. 351 [E. T. 469]) *the unrighteous* ; a specially significant designation of the *heathen* (see on Gal. ii. 5), as

¹ Bengel says aptly : “ *grandi verbo notatur laesa majestas Christianorum.* ” Schrader imports an *ironical* meaning into the word, which is irrelevant. The right interpretation is given by Chrysostom : *τόλμης ἐστὶ τὸ πᾶγμα καὶ παρανομίας*. See as to *τολμᾶν*, *sustinere, non erubescere*, Stallbaum, *ad Plat. Phil.* p. 13 D ; Jacobs, *ad Athen. addit.* p. 309. Comp. the proverbial phrase *πάν τολμᾶν*.

² It is out of the harmony with the fervid tone of the whole passage, in which question is heaped on question, to understand

ver. 1 as *affirmative* (against Lachmann). Least of all can we agree with Hofmann in taking the words down to *ἀδίκων* affirmatively, and then regarding *κ. οὐχὶ ἐπ. τ. ἁγίων* as a query that strikes in there : for *ἐπὶ τ. ἀδίκων, καὶ οὐχὶ ἐπ. τ. ἁγ.*, is plainly just the ordinary antithesis of assertion and negation joined together by *καὶ οὐ*. To make Hofmann's rendering logically tenable, it would be needful that Paul should, instead of *κ. οὐχί*, have written : *καὶ τὶ οὐχί*, and *why not* before the saints ?

contrasted with the Christians, who are ἅγιοι (see on i. 2). Chrysostom puts it well : οὐκ εἶπεν· ἐπὶ τῶν ἀπίστων (as in ver. 6, where the opposite of ἀδελφός was required), ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τῶν ἀδίκων, λέξιν θεὸς ἣς μάλιστα χρεῖαν εἶχεν εἰς τὴν προκειμένην ὑπόθεσιν, ὥστε ἀποτρέψαι καὶ ἀπαγαγεῖν. There is indeed a *contra-dictio in adjecto* in the κρίνεσθαι ἐπὶ τ. ἀδίκων ! For the *Rabbinical* prohibitions of going to law before the heathen, see Eisenmenger, *Entdeckt. Judenth.* II. p. 472 ff. (e.g. *Tanchuma*, f. 92. 2 : “Statutum est, ad quod omnes Israelitae obligantur, eum, qui litem cum alio habet, non debere eam tractare coram gentibus”). The tribunal intended by Paul is not merely that of *arbitration*, which had passed over from Judaism (see Michaelis, *Einl.* II. p. 1221 f.; comp. Lightfoot, *Hor.* on ver. 4 ; Vitranga, *de Synag.* p. 816 ff.) to Christianity, but his meaning is : instead of carrying on lawsuits against each other before the heathen, they were to adjust their disputes before Christians, which could of course be done only in the way of arbitration¹ (comp. ver. 5) ; according to this, therefore, different *forms* of the κρίνεσθαι are present to the apostle's mind in speaking of the judgment ἐπὶ τ. ἀδ. and ἐπὶ τ. ἀγ. ; in the former case, that by *legal process* ; in the latter, that by *arbitration* through means of διαιτηταί. — Theodoret remarks justly (on ver. 6), that the prohibition of the κρίνεσθαι ἐπὶ τῶν ἀδίκων is not at variance with Rom. xiii. 1 ff. : οὐ γὰρ ἀντιτείνειν κελεύει τοῖς ἄρχουσιν, ἀλλὰ τοῖς ἡδικοῦμένοις νομοθετεῖ μὴ κεχρηῆσθαι τοῖς ἄρχουσι. Τὸ γὰρ αἰρεῖσθαι ἢ ἀδικεῖσθαι ἢ παρὰ τοῖς ὁμοπίστοις δοκιμάζεσθαι τῆς αὐτῶν ἐξηρτάτο γνώμης.

Ver. 2. Ἡ οὐκ οἶδατε κ.τ.λ.] unveils the entire *preposterousness* of the course with which his readers were reproached in the indignant question of ver. 1 : “Dare any of you do that,—or know ye not?” etc. Only on the ground of this not knowing could you betake yourselves to such unworthy κρίνεσθαι ! Σὺ τοινοῦν ὁ μέλλων κρίνειν ἐκείνους τότε, πῶς ὑπ' ἐκείνων ἀνέχῃ κρίνεσθαι νῦν ; Chrysostom. — τὸν κόσμον κρινούσι] *at the last judgment*, namely, *sitting along with Christ as judges over all who are not Christians* (κόσμος). Comp. as early a passage as Wisd. iii. 8. We have here the same conception²—only generalized with respect to the subjects of judgment—as in Matt. xix. 28 ; Luke xxii. 30. It stands in essential and logical connection with the participation in the glory of Christ (iv. 8 ; Rom. viii. 17 ; 2 Tim. ii. 11 f.), which Christians are to attain after the Parousia, and after they themselves have been judged (Rom. xiv. 10 ; 2 Cor. v. 10 ; 2 Tim. iv. 1). We must not, however, refer this (with Hofmann) to the period of the reign of Christ and His people predicted in Rev. xx. 4 (when the κόσμος, too, shall be subjected to their judicial authority), especially seeing that Chiliasm is a specifically Apocalyptic and not a Pauline conception ; comp. on xv. 24. Chrysostom again, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Theophylact, Schol. ap. *Matth.*, Erasmus, and others, explain it of an *indirect, not literal* judging, namely, either by the faith and life of Christians placing the guilt of the κόσμος in a clearer light in the day of judgment (Matt. xii. 41), or by their *approving* of the judicial sentence of Christ (Estius, Maier). But this (although as-

¹ Hence this passage does not at all run counter to the injunction to obey magistrates. Comp. Weiss, *bibl. Theol.* p. 417.

² Observe that this view necessarily presupposes the *resurrection* of *unbelievers* also (Acts xvii. 31). Comp. on xv. 24.

sumed by Billroth as the *ideal* truth which underlay the words of the apostle, unconsciously to himself) is an alteration of the sense which runs counter to the context ; for the whole argument *a majori ad minus* is destroyed, if κρινοῦσι is to be understood in a one-sided way as equivalent to κατακρ., and if no proper and personal act of judgment is designed.¹ It is a mistake also to hold, with Lightfoot, Vitringa, Baumgarten, Bolten, that Paul means *quod Christiani futuri sint magistratus* (Lightfoot), which is at variance with ver. 3, and with the conception of the speedily approaching Parousia. Mosheim, Ernesti, Nösselt, Rosenmüller, and Stolz turn the “*shall judge*” into “*can judge*,” comparing ii. 15, 16. But this, too, is to alter the notion of κρίνειν in a way contrary to the text (judge of) : and the *can*, since it would have an emphasis of special significance here, and would denote “be in a position to,” would require to be expressly inserted. Comp. rather the prophetic basis of the thought in Dan. vii. 22. — καὶ εἰ ἐν ὑμῖν κ.τ.λ.] The quick striking in of the καί in the very front of the question is as in ver. 2 ; see also Fritzsche, *ad Marc.* p. 123. — εἰ ἐν ὑμ. κρ. ὁ κόσμ.] repeats with emphasis, and with an individualizing force (ὑμῖν), the contents of the truth already stated and established to the believing consciousness (hence the present κρίνεται). The ἐν ὑμῖν, here emphatically put first, does not mean, as Chrysostom and Theophylact think,² *in your instance, exemplo vestro* (see above), but *among you*, i.e. *in consessu vestro* (see Kypke, II. p. 199), so that the essential meaning is not different from *coram* (Ast, *ad Plat. Leg.* p. 33. 285) ; comp. ἐν δικασταῖς, Thuc. i. 53. 1, ἐν νομοθέταις κ.τ.λ. See, too, the passages in Wetstein. The ἐν therefore by no means stands for ὑπό (Raphel, Flatt, *al.*), although we may gather from the context that the ὑμεῖς are themselves the parties judging (vv. 2, 4). Nor has it the force of *through* (Grotius, Billroth, *al.*), in support of which it is a mistake to appeal to Acts xvii. 31, where, owing to the connection, ἐν stands in a wholly different relation from what it denotes here. Here the word ἐν is selected in view of the following κριτήρια, the Christians, who are in future to judge, being conceived of, in order to the more vivid representation of the idea, as a *judicial assembly*. — ἀνάξ. ἐστε κριτ. ἐλαχ.] κριτήριον does not mean *matter of dispute, case at law*, as most expositors (even Pott, Flatt, Rückert, de Wette, Osiander, Maier, Ewald), wish to take it, with no evidence at all from the usage of the language in their favour, but *place of judgment (tribunal, seat of justice, Jas. ii. 6 ; Plato, Legg. vi. p. 767 B ; Susanna, 49), or judicial trial which is held (judicium)*. Comp. the precept : μὴ ἐρχέσθω ἐπὶ κριτήριον ἐθνικόν, *Constitt. ap.* ii. 45. Precisely so with δικαστήριον. The latter sense, *judicial trial* (Lucian, *bis accus.* 25 ; Polybius, ix. 33. 12, xvi. 27. 2 ; Judg. v. 10 ; Dan. vii. 10, 26), is the true one here, as is evident from ver. 4. We render therefore : *Are ye unworthy to hold very trivial trials ? i.e. trials in which judgment is to be given upon very insignificant matters (in comparison with the lofty and important functions which are to devolve upon you when the future judgment shall be held).* The Vulgate translates freely but correctly

¹ Hence, too, it is unsuitable to transform the concrete meaning of this question into a general participation in the reign of Christ

(Flatt, Heydenreich).

² Comp. too, van Hengel, *ad Rom.* ii. 27 : “*vita vestra cum vita eorum comparanda.*”

as to the sense : “indigni estis, qui de minimis judicetis ?” According to Chrysostom and Theophylact, *others* understand here the *heathen* courts of justice, either *affirmatively* (so, as it appears, Chrysostom and Theophylact themselves ; so, too, Valckenaer, *al.*) or *interrogatively* (Billroth) : *and that it is unworthy of you to be judged before courts of so low a kind?* Similarly, Olshausen. But ver. 4 is decisive against this ; for we have there the very same thing which in ver. 2 is expressed by κριτηρ. ἐλαχ., described as βιωτικὰ κριτήρια.

Vv. 3, 4. Climactic parallels to ver. 2, ver. 3 corresponding to the first half of the preceding verse, and ver. 4 to the second ; hence ver. 4 also should be taken as a *question*. — ἀγγέλους] *angels*, and that—since no defining epithet is added—in the *good* sense, not as Chrysostom, Theodoret, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Erasmus) Beza, Calovius, Bengel, and most commentators make it, *demons* (Jude 6 ; 2 Pet. ii. 4), nor good *and* bad angels (so Cornelius à Lapide, *al.*; also, as it would appear, Hofmann). Other expositors, such as Grotius, Billroth, Rückert, de Wette, leave the point undecided. But comp. on iv. 9. That *angels* themselves shall come within the sphere of the judicial activity of glorified believers, is stated here as a proposition established to the believing consciousness of the readers,—a proposition, the ground for which is to be found in the fact that in Christ, whose glorified saints will reign with Him, is given the absolute truth and the absolute right, and, consequently, the highest judicial court of resort, even as regards the world of angels, from the jurisdiction of which not even the loftiest of created beings can be excepted. There is nothing of a more detailed nature on this subject in the N. T. ; but comp. in general, Heb. i. 14, according to which their service must be one for which they are to render an account ; and Gal. i. 8, according to which, in a certain supposed case, they would incur an ἀνάθεμα.¹ All modes of explaining away the simple meaning of the words are just as inadmissible as in ver. 2 ; as, for example, Chrysostom : ὅταν γὰρ αἱ ἀσώματοι δυνάμεις αὐταὶ ἐλαττον ἡμῶν εὐρεθῶσιν ἔχουσαι τῶν σάρκα περιβεβλημένων, χαλεπωτέραν δώσουσι δίκην ; Erasmus : “vestra pietas illorum impietatem, vestra innocentia illorum impuritatem condemnabit ;” Calovius : the *judicium* is *approbativum*, making manifest, that is to say, before the whole world the victory of the saints already in this life over the devil ; Lightfoot : what is meant is, that the influence of the kingdom of Satan is to be destroyed by Christianity ; while Nösselt, Ernesti, and Stolz make it *ability* to judge, if an angel were to preach a false gospel (Gal. i. 8). — μήτιγε βιωτικά] is not to be included in the question, so that we should have to put only a comma after κρινοῦμεν (as Tischendorf does). For βιωτικά, things *which belong to the necessities of this life*, disputes as to the *meum* and *tuum* (comp. Polybius, xiii. 1. 3 : τῶν βιωτικῶν συναλλαγμάτων), will not be among the subjects of the *future* judgment, to which κρινοῦμεν refers. We must retain, therefore, the mark of interrogation after κρινοῦμεν (Lachmann), and

¹ Observe also the different classes of angels referred to in Rom. viii. 38 ; Eph. i. 21 ; Col. i. 16 ; 1 Pet. iii. 32. We cannot conceive these distinctions in rank to exist

without *ethical* grounds. Moreover, the angels are not to be regarded as *absolutely* good, Mark x. 18. Comp. on Col. i. 20. (o)

put a full stop after βιωτ., so that μήτιγε βιωτ. may be seen to be the condensed *conclusio*: to say nothing then of private disputes! i.e. How far less can it be doubtful that we have to judge βιωτικά! Comp. Dem. Ol. i. (ii.) 23, and Bremi in loc. p. 159. See generally as to μήτιγε (found only here in the N. T.), *nedum sc. dicam*; Herm. ad Viger. p. 803; Schaefer, Appar. ad Dem. I. p. 265; Hartung, Partikell. II. p. 154 f. Regarding the relation of βιωτικός to the later Greek, see Lobeck, ad Phryn. p. 355.—The *antithesis* of ἀγγέλους and βιωτικά turns on this, that the former belong to the higher superterrestrial sphere of life (ὡς ἂν ἐκείνων οὐ κατὰ τὸν βίον τοῦτον ὄντων, Theodore of Mopsuestia). The ἀγγέλ. without the article is *qualitative*.

Ver. 4. Βιωτικά μὲν οὖν κ.τ.λ.] takes up βιωτ. at once again with emphasis. Comp. Herod. vii. 104: τὰ ἂν ἐκεῖνος ἀνώγει ἀνώγει δὲ ταῦτ' αἰεί.—The sentence may be understood as a *question* (of astonishment), so de Wette, Tischendorf, Ewald, *al.*; or as a reproachful *statement*, so Lachmann. The former, if τ. ἐξουθ. be correctly explained, corresponds best with the whole structure of this animated address (see on ver. 3). Μὲν οὖν is the simple *accordingly, thus*.¹ Κριτήρια are here also not *lawsuits*, but *judicia*, as in ver. 2. The meaning therefore is: *If ye then have courts of trial as to private matters, i.e. if ye are in such circumstances as to have to hold courts of that kind.* Comp. Dem. 1153. 4: ἐχόντων τὰς δίκας, *qui lites habent administrandas*. Hofmann's rendering is a most involved one, making βιωτ. *κριτ. predicate to* τοὺς ἐξουθ. ἐν τ. ἐκκλ., and ἐὰν ἐχ. a *parenthetical clause*, to which we are to supply as its object ἐξουθενημένους.² —καθίζετε] *do ye*—instead of taking some from among yourselves for this purpose—*set those down*, etc.? namely, upon the judgment-seat as judges, which follows from κριτήρια. Comp. Plato, Legg. ix. p. 873 E; Dem. 997. 23; Polyb. ix. 33. 12. It is the *indicative*, and the ἐξουθενήμ. ἐν τ. ἐκκλ. are *the heathen*. So in substance Valla, Faber, Castalio, Luther, Calovius, Wolf, *al.*, including Pott, Flatt, Heydenreich, Schrader, Rückert, Olshausen, de Wette, Ewald, Maier, Neander, Weiss; Osiander is undecided. To this it is objected that καθίζ. does not suit heathen magistrates, and that ἐν τ. ἐκκλ. indicates the ἐξουθ. as members of the church (see especially Kypke, II. p. 201). But neither objection is valid; for the term καθίζετε is purposely selected as *significant* of the strange audacity shown in making the matter in dispute *dependent* on the decision of a heathen court, and that in special keeping with the contrast (τοὺς ἐξουθ.), while the text does not give τοὺς ἐν τῇ ἐκκλ. Moreover, by τ. ἐξουθ., Paul does not mean to describe the contempt for the heathen as *justifiable* (Hofmann's objection), but simply as *existing*, as a fact, however, the universal existence of which made the absurdity of the procedure here censured very palpable. Other interpreters make καθίζ. *imperative*, and the ἐξουθ. *members of the church* held in small account: take (rather) *minimos de piorum plebe* as arbiters.³ But not to speak

¹ Introducing the more detailed development of the thought to which expression had been given already. See Baeumlein, Partik. p. 181.

² How meaningless this would be! Moreover, see below. Comp. also Laurent.

neutest. Stud. p. 127.

³ So the Vulgate, Peshito, Chrysostom, Theodoret, Theophylact, Erasmus, Beza, Vatablus, Calvin, Grotius, Estius, Bengel, Wetstein, Hofmann, *al.*

of the *rather* generally supplied from imagination, nor of the fact that to designate those less *capable of judging* as τ. ἐξουθ. ἐν τ. ἐκκλ. would be far from wise, and likely to lend countenance to the specially Corinthian conceit of knowledge,—if this were the true sense, Paul would have had to lay stress upon the *church-membership* of the despised persons, and must have written at least τοὺς ἐξουθ. τοὺς ἐν τ. ἐκκλ. For οἱ ἐξουθ. ἐν τ. ἐκκλ. are *those who are despised in the church*, which leaves it altogether to the context to decide whether they themselves belong to the church or not. Now, that the latter is the case here is shown by vv. 1, 2, and especially by ver. 5 : οὐκ ἔνι ἐν ὑμῖν. Arrangements of words like τοὺς ἐξουθ. ἐν τῇ ἐκκλ. for τοὺς ἐν τ. ἐκκλ. ἐξουθ. are common enough in classical writers also. See Kühner, *ad Xen. Anab.* iv. 2. 18. — τούτους] with an emphasis of disdain. See Dissen, *ad Dem. de Cor.* p. lii. f., 225 ; Krüger, *Anab.* i. 6. 9 ; Ellendt, *Lex. Soph.* II. p. 460.

Ver. 5. Πρὸς ἐντρ. ὑμῖν λέγω] is to be referred, as is done by Lachmann, Tischendorf, Neander, and Hofmann, to ver. 4, comp. xv. 34 (it is commonly referred to what comes after), so that the following question *unfolds the humiliating consideration* involved in ver. 4. The address thus acquires more point and impressiveness. — οὕτως] belongs not to λέγω (Hofmann), but to οὐκ ἔνι κ.τ.λ., and sums up the state of things : *sic igitur, rebus ita comparatis*, since you τοὺς ἐξουθενημένους καθίζετε. See Bornemann in Rosenmüller's *Repert.* II. p. 245 ff. ; Hermann, *ad Viger.* p. 933. C. Fr. Hermann, *ad Lucian. de hist. conscr.* p. 161. It is otherwise understood by Chrysostom, Theophylact, Luther, *al.*, including Flatt, Billroth, Rückert, Olshausen, Ewald, who make it : *so much, so completely* is there lacking, etc. But it is only the definition of *mode*, not of *degree*, that will suit the absolute negation of this clause, intensified as it is by οὐδὲ εἰς. — Regarding ἐνι, see on Gal. iii. 28. The σοφός carries point against the Corinthian self-conceit. — οὐδὲ εἰς] *ne unus quidem*. “Quod est vehementius,” as Erasmus well puts it, “cum sitis tum multi.” See on John i. 3, and Krüger, *Anab.* iii. 1. 3 ; Bornemann and Poppo, *ad Cyrop.* ii. 1. 21. Comp. *non ullus* (Kühner, *ad Cic. Tusc.* i. 39. 94) *nemo unus* (Locella, *ad Xen. Eph.* p. 137). Frequent in Isocr., see Bremi, I. *Exc.* iii. — ὅς δυνήσεται] purely future in force : *who* (as cases shall occur) *will be able*. — διακρίναι] *to judge*, as arbitrator. — ἀνὰ μέσον τ. ἀδ. αὐτοῦ] *between* (LXX. Gen. xvi. 5 ; Ex. xi. 7 ; Ezek. xxii. 26 ; Isa. lvii. 11 ; Matt. xiii. 25 ; Theocr. xxii. 21 ; Strabo, xi. 5. 1, p. 503 ; Polyb. x. 48. 1, v. 55. 7) *his* (Christian) *brother*. The expression τ. ἀδελφοῦ, is meant to *put to shame*. The *singular* is used for this reason, that τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ must mean the *plaintiff* who brings on the lawsuit (not the *defendant*, as Ewald would have it), *between whom* (and, as is obvious, the defendant) the arbitrator, called into requisition by the bringing of the suit, pronounces his decision. Were the *plural* employed, that would indicate the *two* litigants generally, but not the party *bringing on the suit* in particular. Hofmann, contrary to the plain meaning of the words, understands the phrase of the *self-decision* of the individual demanding or refusing, namely, as to the point where his right ceased and his wrong began. In that case, Paul, if he wished to be intelligible, would

have required to say something like this : διακρίναι ἐν ἑαυτῷ πρὸς τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ. Moreover, οὐδὲ εἰς (or οὐδεὶς as Hofmann reads) would militate against this view, seeing that it contains what would be, according to ver. 1, a *disproportionate* accusation, if the meaning is not, “not a single man fitted to be an arbitrator.” — The reading, τ. ἀδελφοῦ κ. τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ (Syr. Arr.), is an interpretation, although recommended by Grotius and again by Laurent.

Ver. 6. Quick reply to the preceding question : *No* (see Hartung, *Partikell.* II. p. 37 ; Baeumlein, *Partikell.* p. 10 f.) *brother goes to law with brother, and that* (see on Rom. xiii. 11) *before unbelievers.*¹ How then can there be such a wise man among you ? He would assuredly, by his intervention as arbitrator, keep the matter from coming to a lawsuit, which, as between Christian brethren, and that, too, before a heathen court, is altogether unfitting and unworthy ! κρίνεται in precisely the same sense as in ver. 1, κρίνεσθαι ἐπὶ τῶν ἀδίκων. (P)

Ver. 7. Μὲν οὖν] as in ver. 4 ; it now brings under special consideration the foregoing ἀδελφ. μετὰ ἀδ. κρίνεται—namely, as to what the real character of such a proceeding may be in itself viewed generally (ὅλως being taken as in v. 1), apart from the special element unhappily added in Corinth, ἐπὶ ἀπίστων. The μέν corresponds as little (against Hofmann) to the ἀλλά which follows in ver. 8, as the μέν in ver. 4 to the ἀλλά in ver. 6. The ἤδη is the logical *already* (“*already then, viewed generally*”), in reference to something special, by which the case is made yet worse. Comp. Hartung, *Partikell.* I. p. 240 f. — ἡττημα] a *defeat* (see on Rom. xi. 12), *i.e. damage, loss*, and that, according to the context, not *moral decay* (so commonly), or *hurt to the church* (Hofmann), or *imperfection* (Billroth, Rückert), or *weakness* (Beza) ; but, it redounds to your *coming short of the Messianic salvation* (see ver. 9).—ἐαυτῶν] like ἀλλήλων, but giving them to feel, more strongly than the latter would, the *impropriety* which had a place in *their own circle* (Kühner, *ad Xen. Mem.* ii. 6. 20). — κρίματα] as in Rom. v. 16, Wisd. xii. 12, *legal judgments*, which they had respectively obtained (ἔχετε). — ἀδικεῖσθε . . . ἀποστερ.] *middles : to allow wrong and loss to be inflicted on themselves.* Comp. Vulgate. See Bernhardt, p. 346 f. As to the matter itself, see Matt. v. 39 ff. ; example of Jesus, 1 Pet. ii. 23.

Ver. 8. The question beginning with διατί in ver. 7 still continues : Why do ye not rather allow yourselves to suffer wrong, etc., *and not, on your part, do wrong, etc. ?* This view, instead of the *ordinary* one, which makes ver. 8 an independent sentence like ver. 6, is necessary, because ἡ οὐκ οἶδατε in ver. 9 has its logical reference in διατί. The reference, namely, is this : “*There is no ground conceivable for your not,*” etc. (διατί . . . ἀδελφούς), “*unless that ye knew not,*” etc. (ἡ οὐκ οἶδατε). — καὶ τοῦτο ἀδελφούς] to whom nevertheless, as your brethren, the very opposite was due from you ! With respect to the climactic κ. τοῦτο, *and that*, see on Rom. xii. 11, and Baeumlein, *Partik.* p. 147.

¹ To take the sentence as a reproachful assertion (so Luther, Beza, Lachmann, Osiander, Hofmann), makes the passage

sterner and more telling than the common way of viewing it as a *question*, which is adopted also by Tischendorf and Ewald.

Ver. 9. Ἡ οὐκ οἶδατε] See on ver. 8. To supply an unexpressed thought here ("Do not regard the matter lightly," Billroth ; "This is a far greater ἡττημα," Ruckert ; that ἡττημα to the church "they could only fail to perceive, if they did not know," etc., Hofmann) is just as arbitrary as to do so in ver. 2 — ἄδικοι] the general conception (under which the preceding ἀδικεῖν and ἀποστ. are included): *unrighteous, immoral*. See the enumeration which follows. — Θεοῦ βασιλ.] the Θεοῦ coming close after ἄδικοι, and put first for emphasis (see the critical remarks). As to the truth itself, that ἀδικία excludes from the Messiah's kingdom, see on Gal. v. 21 ; and as regards what is implied in the Messianic κληρονομία, on Gal. iii. 18 ; Eph. i. 11. — μὴ πλανᾶσθε] for that moral fundamental law was more easily, it is plain, flung to the winds in frivolous Corinth than anywhere else ! Possibly, too, some might even say openly : φιλάνθρωπος ὢν ὁ Θεὸς καὶ ἀγαθός, οὐκ ἐπεξέρχεται τοῖς πλημμελήμασι· μὴ δὲ φοβηθῶμεν ? Chrysostom. Hence : *be not mistaken* (πλανᾶσθε, *passive*, as also in xv. 33 ; Gal. vi. 7 ; Luke xxi. 8 ; Jas. i. 16 ; comp. the active form in 1 John iii. 7), followed by the emphatic repetition of that fundamental law with a many-sided breaking up of the notion ἄδικοι into particulars, not, however, arranged systematically, or in couples, nor reducible, save by force, to any logical scheme ;¹ in this enumeration, owing to the state of matters in the place, the sins of sensuality are most amply specified. — πόρνοι, *fornicators* in general ; μοιχοί, *adulterers*, Heb. xiii. 4. — εἰδωλολ.] see on v. 11. — μαλακοί] *effeminates*, commonly understood as *qui muliebria patiuntur*, but with no sufficient evidence from the usage of the language (the passages in Wetstein and Kypke, even Dion. Hal. vii. 2, do not prove the point) ; moreover, such catamites (*molles*) were called πόρνοι or κίναιδοι. One does not see, moreover, why precisely *this* sin should be mentioned twice over in different aspects. Rather therefore : *effeminate luxurious livers*. Comp. Aristotle, *Eth.* vii. 7 : μαλακὸς καὶ τρυφῶν, Xen. *Mem.* ii. 1, 20, also μαλακῶς, iii. 11. 10 : τρυφή δὲ καὶ μαλθακία, Plato, *Rep.* p. 590 B. — ἀρσενοκοῖται] *sodomites*, who defile themselves with men (1 Tim. i. 10 ; Eusebius, *Praep. evang.* p. 276 D). Regarding the wide diffusion of this vice, see the passages in Wetstein ; comp. on Rom. i. 27, and Hermann, *Privatalterth.* § 29, 17 ff.

Ver. 11. How unworthy are such of your new *Christian* relations ! — ταῦτα] of persons in a contemptuous sense : *such trash, such a set*. See Bernhardy, p. 281. — τινές] more exact definition of the subject of ἦτε, namely, that all are not meant. It is the well-known σχῆμα καθ' ὅλον καὶ μέρος (Kühner, II. p. 156). Comp. Grotius. Valckenaer says well : "vocula τινές dictum paulo durius emollit." Billroth is wrong in holding (as Vorstius before him) that ταῦτά τινες belong to each other, and are equivalent to τοιοῦτοί. In that case ταῦτά τινα would be required, or τοιοῖοί τινες. See Ast, *ad Plat. Legg.* p. 71 ; Bornemann, *ad Xen. Cyr.* ii. 1. 2 ; Ellendt, *Lex. Soph.* II. p. 832. — ἀπελούσ. κ.τ.λ.] describes from step to step the new relations established by their reception of Christianity. First of all : *ye washed yourselves clean*, namely, by your immersion in the waters of baptism, from the

¹ Comp. Ernesti, *Ursprung der Sünde*, II. p. 29 f.

moral defilement of the guilt of your sins (you obtained, through means of baptism, the forgiveness of your sins committed before you became Christians). (q) Comp. Acts xxii. 16, ii. 38 ; Eph. v. 26 ; 1 Pet. iii. 21. Observe the use of the *middle*, arising from the conception of their *self-destination* for baptism. Comp. ἐβαπτίσαντο, x. 2. We must not take the middle here for the *passive*, as most expositors do, following the Vulgate (so Flatt, Pott, Billroth, Olshausen, Ewald), which in part arose—as in the case of Olshausen—from dogmatical preconceptions ; neither is it to be understood, with Usteri (*Lehrbegriff*, p. 230) and Rückert (comp. Loesner, p. 278), of *moral* purification by laying aside everything sinful, of the *putting off the old man* (comp. Rom. vi. 2 ff.), against which the same phrase in Acts xxii. 16, and the analogous one, καθάρισας, in Eph. v. 26, militate strongly. This moral regeneration *exists* in connection with baptism (Tit. iii. 5), but is not *designated* by ἀπελούσ., although its subjective conditions, μετάνοια and πίστις are *presupposed* in the latter expression. The producing of regeneration, which is by water *and* Spirit, is implied in the ἡγιάσθητε which follows : *ye became* (from being unholy, as ye were before baptism) *holy*, inasmuch, namely, as by receiving the δωρεὰ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος (Acts ii. 38) ye were translated into that moral frame of life which is Christian and consecrated to God (John iii. 5 ; Tit. iii. 5 ; Eph. v. 25, ἁγίαση). Rückert and Olshausen take it in the theocratic sense : “ye became set apart, numbered among the ἅγιοι.” Comp. Osiander, also Hofmann : “*incorporated in the holy church.*” But the progression of thought here, which marks its advance towards a climax by the repetition of the ἀλλά, requires, not a threefold description of the transaction involved in baptism (Calvin, Hofmann), but three *different* characteristic points, dating their commencement from baptism, and forming, as regards their substance, the new moral condition of life from which those who have become Christians ought not again to fall back. — ἐδικαιώθητε] *ye were made righteous.*¹ This, however, cannot mean the *imputative* justification of Rom. iii. 21 (de Wette, Osiander, Hofmann, with older commentators ; because, in the first place, this is already given in the ἀπελούσασθε ; and secondly, because the ἐδικαιώθητε, if used in this sense, would have needed not to follow the ἡγιάσθητε, but to precede it, as in i. 30 ; for to suppose a *descending* climax (Calovius) is out of the question, if only on account of the ἀπελούσ., which so manifestly indicates the *beginning* of the Christian state. What is meant, and that by way of contrast to the notion of ἀδικία which prevails in ver. 9 f., is the *actual moral* righteousness of life,² which has been brought about as *the result of the operation of the Spirit* which began with baptism, so that now there is seen in the man the fulfilment of the moral demands or of the δικαίωμα τοῦ νόμου (Rom. viii. 4), and he himself, being dead unto sin, δεδικαίωται ἀπὸ τῆς ἁμαρτίας (Rom. vi.

¹ [Beet says, with justice, “a solitary instance, probably, in the New Testament of this simplest sense.” — T. W. C.]

² There is therefore no warrant for adding this passage, as is done on the Roman Catholic side (even by Döllinger), in

opposition to the distinction between justification and sanctification. Justification is comprised already in ἀπελούσ. Comp. Weiss, *bibl. Theol.* pp. 342, 345 ff. Its subjective basis, however, is one with that of sanctification, namely, faith.

7), and ἐδουλώθη τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ (Rom. vi. 18), whose instruments his members have now become in the *καινότης* of the spirit and life (Rom. vi. 13). This *δικαιωθῆναι* does not stand related to the *ἀγιασθῆναι* in any sort of tautological sense, but is the effect and outcome of it, and in so far, certainly, is also the moral *continuatio justificationis* (comp. Calovius), Rev. xxii. 11.—The thrice repeated ἀλλά lays a special emphasis upon each of the three points. Comp. Xenophon, *Anab.* v. 8. 4 ; Aristophanes, *Acharn.* 402 ff. ; 2 Cor. ii. 17, vii. 11 ; Wyttenbach, *ad Plat. Phaed.* p. 142 ; Bornemann, *ad Xen. Symp.* iv. 53 ; Buttmann, *neut. Gramm.* p. 341 [E. T. 398]. — ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι . . . ἡμῶν] is by most expositors made to refer to all the three points. But since ἐν τῷ πνεύματι κ.τ.λ. does not accord with ἀπελούσ. (for the Spirit is only received *after* baptism, Acts ii. 38, xix. 5, 6 ; Tit. iii. 5, 6 ; the case in Acts x. 47 is *exceptional*), it is better, with Rückert, to connect ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι . . . ἡμῶν simply with ἐδικαιώθ., which best harmonizes also with the *significant* importance of the ἐδικαιώθητε as the crowning point of the whole transformation wrought in the Christian. The *name of the Lord Jesus*, i.e. what pronouncing the name “Κύριος Ἰησοῦς” (xii. 3) affirms,—this, as the contents of the faith and confession, is that in which the becoming morally righteous had its causal basis (ἐν), and equally had its ground in *the Spirit of our God*, since it was He who established it by His sanctifying agency ; *through that name* its origin was subjectively conditioned, and *through that Spirit* it was objectively realized. Were we, with Hofmann, to bring ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι . . . Θεοῦ ἡμῶν into connection with the πάντα μοι ἐξεστίν which follows, the latter would at once become limited and defined in a way with which the antitheses ἀλλ’ κ.τ.λ. would no longer in that case harmonize. For it is precisely in the *absoluteness* of the πάντα μοι ἐξεστίν that these antitheses have their ethical correctness and significance, as being the moral limitation of that axiom, which therefore appears again absolutely in x. 23. — Observe, further, how, notwithstanding the defective condition of the church in point of fact, the *aorist* ἡγιασθ. and ἐδικαιώθ. have their warrant as *acts of God*, and in accordance with the *ideal* view of what is the specifically Christian condition, however imperfectly as yet this may have been realized, or whatever backsliding may have taken place. The *ideal* way of speaking, too, corresponds to the *design* of the apostle, who is seeking to make his readers feel the *contradiction* between their conduct and the character which as Christians they assumed at conversion ; σφόδρα ἐν τρεπτικῷς ἐπήγαγε λέγων· ἐννοήσατε ἡλίκων ὑμᾶς ἐξείλετο κακῶν ὁ Θεός κ.τ.λ., Chrysostom. And thereby he seeks morally to raise them.

Vv. 12–20. *Correction of the misunderstanding of Christian liberty, as though fornication, equally with the use of meats, came under the head of things allowable* (vv. 12–17). *Admonitions against fornication* (vv. 18–20).

Vv. 12–14. *Connection and sequence of thought. In this new condition of life* (ver. 11) *all things are allowed to us, but they must be for our good,—all things allowed, but we on our part must remain free* (ver. 12). *Among these allowed things is the use of food, as what is in accordance with nature and appointed by God merely for a time* (τὰ βρώματα . . . καταργ., ver. 13). *Wholly otherwise is it with the use of the body for fornication ; that is anti-Christian*

(τὸ δὲ σῶμα . . . σώματι, ver. 13), and contrary to the eternal destiny fixed by God for the body (ver. 14). — Not without reason did Paul, when reckoning up the different forms of ἀδικία in ver. 9, place πορνεία first. Comp. v. 1 ; 2 Cor. xii. 21. But Corinthian Epicureanism, starting from the Hellenic mode of viewing this matter, which was altogether very lax (Herm. *Privatalterth.*, § 29. 13 ff.), easily found for itself even a certain justification of fornication, namely, in the doctrine of Christian *liberty in adiaphoris*, the maxim of which is : πάντα μοι ἔξεστιν. Now we may infer from the passage before us that this erroneous justification had *actually* been brought forward, that more than one voluptuary in the church had, as Paul was informed, actually declared that just as satisfying the desire for food was an *adiaphoron*, so also was satisfying the desire for sensual pleasure by fornication. Comp. Baur in the *theol. Jahrb.* 1852, 1 and 3 ; Weiss, *bibl. Theol.* p. 420 f. Olshausen, indeed, thinks that Paul would have given an absolute command to exclude all such persons from the church, and that therefore it is only the *possibility* of so gross an abuse of Christian liberty that is implied here. But the former is an arbitrary assumption,¹ and the latter has these two considerations against it—first, that in no other Epistle does Paul touch on this possibility, although the opinion that licentious intercourse was allowable was widely spread among the Greeks and Romans ; and secondly, that the statement of the moral difference between the use of meats and whoredom is of too special a kind to be naturally accounted for in the absence of actual occasion. Neander, whose objections lose their force, if we only do not go the length of assuming that this adiaphoristic view of fornication had become universal in Corinth, or had been formally published and propagated there as a doctrinal tenet, is of opinion that Paul meant to begin here upon the theme of meat offered to idols (comp. x. 23), but was led on after the first half of ver. 13 to draw a contrast (perhaps in order to guard against a misunderstanding of his words, perhaps also in opposition to those who denied the resurrection) which conducted him so far away from his theme, that it was only in chap. viii. that he made his way back to it again from another point. But how arbitrary this is ! And how entirely unexampled a thing, that the apostle should so far forget himself, and write in a manner so irregular and open to misconception ! Chap. x. 23 lends no support to this exposition, for it is obvious that the same maxim could be made to apply in very many different directions. Rückert's exegesis is only a little less violent ; he supposes that, in the question addressed to the apostle about the sacrificial meat, the party eating it had adduced the πάντα ἔξεστιν in their favour, and that Paul had only *transferred it here in order to guard against the abuse of it respecting fornication* (in substance, therefore, coinciding with Olshausen). To the ordinary interpretation Rückert objects, that the Corinthians in their letter would certainly not have described the πορνεία

¹ Olshausen reasons thus : Since in vi. 9 unnatural vices are named with the rest, we should have to conclude that the πάντα μοι ἔξεστιν was applied to these also in Corinth ; now Paul would surely never have

suffered persons guilty of such abominations to remain in the church. But in vv. 13 ff. the apostle is speaking quite distinctly and constantly of the πορνεία alone, not of unnatural sins.

as prevailing among them, nor would they have undertaken the defence of it to the apostle whom they knew so well. But this objection is unfounded; for from v. 1 we must assume that Paul had come to know of the state of morals at Corinth through *oral* reports, and consequently had not learned the abuse there made of the πάντα ἐξεστίν through expressions in the Corinthian letter (this against Hofmann also). According to Ewald, there had been doubts and debates concerning the obligation of the Jewish laws about *food* and *marriage*; Paul therefore lays down in ver. 12 the principle which should decide all such cases, and then at once, in ver. 13, disposes shortly of the first point in dispute, in order, at a later stage (chap. viii.—x.), to speak of it more at length, and hastens on in ver. 13 ff. to the second point. Against this we may urge, first, that the first point was surely too *important* to be disposed of by so brief a hint as that in ver. 13; secondly, that the two halves of ver. 13 stand in an *antithetic* relation to each other, which gives the first half merely the position of an *auxiliary* clause; thirdly, that chap. viii.—x. do not deal with the question of food in general, but with that of eating *sacrificial flesh* in particular; and lastly, that ver. 13 ff. have likewise quite as their *special* subject that of *fornication*. — πάντα μοι ἐξεστίν] might be regarded as *the objection of an opponent* (so Pott and Flatt, with older expositors); hence also it is understood by Theodoret as a question. But this is unnecessary (for surely it is, in point of fact, a Christian, and indeed a specially Pauline principle), and arbitrary besides, since there is here no *formula* of objection (such as ἐρεῖς οὖν, or the like). Comp. on ver. 13. — It would be self-evident to the reader that πάντα meant *all that was in itself indifferent* (whatever was not anti-Christian). — μοι] spoken in the character of a *Christian in general*. Comp. ver. 15. Bengel says well: “Saepe Paulus primâ personâ singul. eloquitur, quae vim habent gnomes.” Comp. Gal. ii. 18. — συμφέρει] *is profitable*. This must not be arbitrarily restricted either in the way of taking it as equivalent to οἰκοδομεῖ (Calvin, *al.*, also Billroth after x. 23), or by confining it to one's own advantage (Grotius, Heumann, Schulz, Olshausen). What is meant is *moral profitableness generally* in every respect, as conditioned by the special circumstances of each case as it arises. So, too, in x. 23. Theodore of Mopsuestia, it may be added, says rightly: ἐπειδὴ γὰρ οὐ πάντα συμφέρει, δῆλον ὡς οὐ πᾶσι χρηστέον, ἀλλὰ τοῖς ὠφελοῦσι μόνοις. — οὐκ ἐγὼ] *not I for my part*. The subjection will not be on *my* side, but the *things* allowed will be what is brought into subjection. This tacit contrast is indicated both by the position of οὐκ ἐγὼ and by ὑπό τινος. The common interpretation: “*ego sub nullius redigar potestatem*” (Vulgate), does not correspond to the order of the words. — ἐξουσιασθ.] purely future in force: *shall be ruled* by anything whatever. This result, that on my part moral freedom should be lost through anything, will not ensue! Otherwise the thing would plainly be *not* allowed. I shall preserve the power of moral self-determination, so as to do or leave undone, just according to the moral relations constituted by the circumstances of the case, what in itself would be allowed to me. Comp. the great thought in iii. 22, and Paul's own example in Phil. iv. 11, 12. Were τινός masculine (Ambrosiaster, Erasmus, Vatablus, Ewald, *al.*), the meaning would then be, that in things indiffer-

ent a man should not yield himself to be tutored and dictated to by others (Ewald). But, in point of fact, it is *neuter*, being in contrast to the thrice repeated and emphatic πάντα. — The *paronomasia* in ἐξέστιν and ἐξουσιάζειν was remarked by expositors as early as Chrysostom and Theophylact. *All is in my power, yet it is not I who will be overpowered by anything.* Regarding ἐξουσιάζειν (which is not used in this sense by Greek writers), comp. Eccles. vii. 19, viii. 8, x. 4 f.

Ver. 13. Τῇ κοιλίᾳ] *sc. ἔστι*, *belong to*, inasmuch, that is to say, as they are destined to be received and digested by the belly (the ὑποδοχῇ τῶν σιτίων, Photius in Oecumenius). Comp. Matt. xv. 17. — τοῖς βρώμασιν] inasmuch as it is destined to receive and digest the food. — This reciprocal destination according to nature is the *first* element, which, in its relation to the second half of the verse, is intended to call attention to the fact, that the case of fornication is totally different from that of the use of food,—that the *latter*, being *in accordance with its destination*, belongs to the category of the *adiaphora*; while *fornication*, on the other hand, which is *anti-Christian*, is contrary to the relation of the body to Christ. The *second* element (which, however, is very closely connected with the first), by which this is made manifest, consists in what God will hereafter do on the one hand with the κοιλίᾳ and the βρώμασι, and on the other hand (ver. 14) in respect of the body's relation as pertaining to Christ, which latter relation is imperishable, in contrast to the perishable nature of the things first mentioned. — ὁ δὲ Θεὸς . . . καταργ.] *i.e.* God, however, will (at the Parousia) cause such a change to take place in the bodily constitution of man and in the world of sense generally, that neither the organs of digestion as such, nor the meats as such, will then be existent. To such passing away is this relation destined by God! With respect to the glorifying of the body here indicated, comp. Matt. xxii. 30; 1 Cor. xv. 44, 51. Melancthon aptly says: “Cibi et venter . . . sunt res periturae; . . . ideo sunt adiaphora;” and Bengel: “quae destruentur, per se liberum habent usum, Col. ii. 20 ff.” Comp. Castalio, and among more modern expositors, Schulz, Krause, Billroth, Rückert, Schrader, Olshausen, de Wette, Osiander, Ewald, Maier, Neander, Hofmann.¹ Pott, Flatt, and Heydenreich (and see still earlier writers in Wolf) approximate to this view, but take τὰ βρώματα . . . καταργ. as words of an *opponent*, the premisses of a conclusion as to the allowableness of fornication, which conclusion is impugned by Paul in the τὸ δὲ σῶμα κ.τ.λ. which follows. But the apostle has not given the slightest hint of this passage being a dialogue; moreover, had it been so, he would have begun his reply ver. 13 with ἀλλά again (as in ver. 12, according to this dialogistic view). Other interpreters, following Chrysostom and Theophylact, make the design of ὁ δὲ Θεὸς κ.τ.λ. to be a warning against excess. Comp. Calvin, Grotius, Calovius, *al.* But this, although in harmony with the ἀλλά in ver. 12, would stand in no logical relation to the ὁ δὲ Θεὸς κ.τ.λ. of ver. 14, and thereby the inner connection of the whole address (see above) would be broken up. — καὶ ταύτην καὶ ταῦτα] Regarding

¹ Several of them, however, fall into the mistake of making the *date* of the καταργ. to be at *death*, which καὶ ταῦτα alone shows to be inadmissible.

the use of the double οὗτος for ἐκεῖνος . . . οὗτος, which is not common, see Bernhardt, p. 277. Comp. Josh. viii. 22 ; 1 Macc. vii. 46, ix. 17. — τὸ δὲ σῶμα] Paul cannot name again here a single organ ; *the whole body* is the organ of fleshly intercourse : ¹ see ver. 16. — τῇ πορνείᾳ] *for fornication* (conceived of as a personal power), for its disposal and use. — τῷ Κυρίῳ] inasmuch as the body is a member of Christ.² See ver. 15. — τῷ σώματι] inasmuch, namely, as Christ is destined (has it as His function) to rule and use the body as His member. “Quanta dignatio !” Bengel. It is a mistake to make the phrase refer to the raising up and glorifying of the body, which it is the part of Christ to effect (Ambrosiaster, Anselm, Thomas, Grotius) ; for this would destroy the unity of mutual reference in the two clauses (comp. above, τὰ βρώματα κ.τ.λ.), and, besides, the resurrection is brought forward afterwards as something separate from the preceding, and that, too, as the work of *God* (parallel to the ὁ δὲ Θεὸς κ.τ.λ. in ver. 13).

Ver. 14. This is parallel in contents and form to the sentence, ὁ δὲ Θεὸς . . . καταργήσει, in ver. 13 : *Now God has not only raised up the Lord, but will raise up us also by His power.* The body, consequently, has a destiny which stretches on into the future eternal αἰών ; how wholly different therefore from the κοιλία, that organ of temporal nourishment, which will cease to be ! — καὶ τὸν Κύρ. ἡγείρε] necessary assurance of what follows. See Rom. viii. 11. Comp. 1 Cor. xv. 20 ; Col. i. 18 ; 2 Cor. iv. 11, 14. — καὶ ἡμᾶς ἐξεγερεῖ ³] The bodily change in the case of those still alive at the time of the Parousia (xv. 51 ; 2 Cor. v. 2–4 ; 1 Thess. iv. 15 ff.) did not need to be specially mentioned, since Paul was not here to enter into detail upon the doctrine of the resurrection. Comp. on Rom. viii. 11. He therefore, in accordance with the τὸν Κύρ. ἡγείρε, designates here the consummation of all things only *a potiori*, namely, as a *raising up*, speaking at the same time in the person of *Christians generally* (ἡμᾶς), and leaving out of view in this general expression his own personal hope that he might survive to the Parousia. — The interchange of ἡγ. and ἐξεγ. (out of the grave, comp. ἐξανάστασις τῶν νεκρῶν, Phil. iii. 11) is accidental, without any special design—in opposition to Bengel and Osiander's arbitrary opinion that the former word denoted the *first-fruits*, and the latter the “*massa dormientium*.” ⁴— αὐτοῦ]—not αὐτοῦ,

¹ Neither our text nor Luke xx. 35 gives any support to the assumption that those partaking in the resurrection will be *without sexual distinction*. The doing away of the κοιλία refers simply to the cessation of the earthly process of nutrition ; it does not affect the identity of the body, which Delitzsch (*Psychol.* p. 459), without warrant from Scripture, pronounces to be independent of the *external* continuance of distinction between the sexes. Such assertions lead to fantastic theories ὑπὲρ ὃ γέγραπται.

² [“Whoever eats food, of whatever kind, puts it to its designed use : whoever commits fornication uses his body in a way for which it was never designed.” Stanley.—T. W. C.]

³ If ἐξεγείρει were the true reading (but see the critical remarks), the tense employed would in that case bring before us as *present* what was certain in the future. If ἐξῆγείρε were correct, we should have to interpret this according to the idea of the resurrection of believers being implied in that of Christ, comp. Col. ii. 12.

⁴ Against this view may be urged the consideration, in itself decisive, that in the whole of chap. xv. ἐγείρω is the term constantly used both of Christ's resurrection and that of believers ; whereas ἐξεγείρω occurs in all the N. T. only here and Rom. ix. 17 (in the latter passage, however, not of the rising of the dead).

because uttered from the standpoint of the writer—applies to *God*, not to Jesus (Theodoret) ; and διὰ τῆς δυνάμ. αὐτ. should be referred not to both the clauses in the sentence (Billroth), but, as its position demands, to ἐξεγερῆ ; for to the ground of faith which the latter has in καὶ τὸν Κύριον ἤγειρε, Paul now adds its undoubted *possibility* (Matt. xxii. 29), perhaps glancing purposely at the deniers of the resurrection, τῇ ἀξιοπιστίᾳ τῆς τοῦ ποιοῦντος ἰσχύος τοὺς ἀντιλέγοντας ἐπιστομίζων, Chrysostom.

Vv. 15–17. That fornication is not an indifferent thing like the use of meats, but anti-Christian, Paul has already *proved* in vv. 13, 14, namely, from this, that the body belongs to Christ and is destined by God to be raised up again. How *deserving of abhorrence* fornication is on that account, he now brings home to the mind of his readers in a striking and concrete way. The immorality of fornication is certainly taken for granted in ver. 15 f., yet not in such a manner as to make Paul guilty of a *petitio principii* (Baur in the *theol. Jahrb.* 1852, p. 538 f.), but on the ground of the proof of this immorality already *given* in vv. 13, 14. In ver. 15 f. the apostle does not seek to *prove* it over again, but to teach the Corinthians to *abhor* the sin. — οὐκ οἴδατε κ.τ.λ.] He here takes up once more, and exhibits with greater fulness, the thought in ver. 13, τὸ σῶμα τῷ Κυρίῳ, as the basis for the following warning : ἄρας οὖν κ.τ.λ. — μέλη Χριστοῦ] Inasmuch, that is to say, as Christ, as the Head of the Christian world, stands to it in the closest and most inward fellowship of organic life (see especially Eph. iv. 16), and forms, as it were, one moral Person with it ; the *bodies* of the individual believers, who in fact belong to the Lord, and He to them for this world and that which is to come (ver. 13 f.), may be conceived as Christ's *members*, just as from the same point of view the whole church of Christ is His collective organ, His body (Rom. xii. 5 ; Eph. i. 23 ; Col. i. 18, ii. 19 ; 1 Cor. xii. 13, *al.*). — ἄρας] Shall I then *take away*, take off, the members of Christ, *and*, etc. Billroth sees in ἄρας simply minuteness of description, indicative of deliberation, as in ἡρπάζω. But this is to confound it with λαβών. The Vulgate renders rightly : *tollens* ; Luke vi. 29, xi. 22 ; John xi. 48 ; Plato, *Pol.* ix. p. 578 E, *Tim.* p. 76 B ; Sophocles, *Trach.* 796 ; 1 Macc. viii. 18. What is depicted is daring *misappropriation*. The *plural* τὰ μέλη denotes the category, for the matter “non quanta sit numero, sed qualis genere sit, spectatur,” Reisig, *Conjec. in Aristoph.* p. 58. Since the Christian's body is among the members of Christ, the πορνέειν is a deed whereby a man takes away the members of Christ from Him whose property they are, and makes them a harlot's members. — ποιήσω] *future* : *Shall this case occur with me?* shall I degrade myself to this? so far forget myself? Rückert and Osiander hold that it is the aorist subjunctive : *should I*, etc. (see Herm. *ad Viger.* p. 742). It is impossible to decide the point.

Ver. 16. Ἡ οὐκ οἴδατε] “Or if this μὴ γένοιτο (conveying, as it does, a *negative* to that question) still appears to you to admit of doubt, even after the statement of the nature of the case given in ver. 15, then ye must be ignorant that,” etc. This ἡ οὐκ οἴδατε cannot correspond with the οὐκ οἴδατε of ver. 15 (Hofmann : “either the one or the other they must be ignorant of,” etc.), for ὅτι ὁ κολλῶμ. κ.τ.λ. manifestly refers to the conclusion

from the preceding expressed in ἄρας οὖν, and therefore is subordinated to the question answered shudderingly with μὴ γένοιτο. In ver. 19, too, the ἡ οὐκ οἶδατε refers to what has just before been said. — κολλῶμ.] *who joins himself to* (פֶּזֶז), indicating the union in licentious intercourse. Comp. Ecclus. xix. 2 ; Gen. ii. 24 ; Ezra iv. 20. — τῇ πόρνῃ] the harlot with whom he deals (article). — ἐν σῶμά ἐστιν] *is a single body* ; previous to the κολλᾶσθαι he and the person concerned were *two* bodies, but he who is *joined* to the harlot—an united subject—is *one body*. — ἔσονται γὰρ κ.τ.λ.] Gen. ii. 24 (quoted from the LXX.) speaks, indeed, of *wedded*, not *unwedded*, intercourse ; but Theodoret rightly points out the *paritas rationis*: ἐν γὰρ καὶ τοῦτο κάκεινο τῇ φύσει τοῦ πράγματος. — φησὶν] Who it is that says it, is self-evident, namely, *God* ; the utterances of the Scripture being His words, even when they may be spoken through another, as Gen. ii. 24 was through Adam. Comp. on Matt. xix. 5. Similarly Gal. iii. 16 ; Eph. iv. 8 ; Heb. viii. 5 ; 1 Cor. xv. 27. Ἡ γραφή, which is what is usually supplied here, would need to be suggested by the context, as in Rom. xv. 10. Rückert arbitrarily prefers τὸ πνεῦμα.¹ — οἱ δύο] *the two in question*. The words are wanting in the Hebrew text, but are always quoted with it in the N. T. (Matt. xix. 5 ; Mark x. 8 ; Eph. v. 31) after the LXX., and also by the Rabbins (*e.g.* *Beresh. Rabb.* 18) ; an addition of later date in the interests of monogamy, which, although not expressly enjoined in the law, came by degrees to prevail, in accordance with its adumbration from the first in the history of the creation (Ewald, *Alterth.* p. 260 f.). — εἰς σάρκα μίαν] לְבָשָׁר אֶחָד. See on Matt. xix. 5.

Ver. 17. Weighty contrast to ὁ κολλῶμ. τῇ πόρνῃ ἐν σῶμά ἐστι, no longer dependent on ὅτι. — κολλᾶσθαι τῷ Κυρίῳ, an expression of close attachment to Jehovah, which is very common in the O. T. (Jer. xiii. 11 ; Deut. x. 20, xi. 22 ; 2 Kings xviii. 6 ; Ecclus. ii. 3, *al.*). It denotes here, *inward union of life with Christ*, and is *selected* to be set against the κολλ. τῇ πόρνῃ in ver. 16, inasmuch as in both cases an *intima conjunctio* takes place, in the one *fleshly*, in the other *spiritual*. We are not to assume that Paul was thinking here, as in Eph. v. 23 ff. (comp. 2 Cor. xi. 2 ; Rom. v. 4), of the union with Christ as a *marriage* (Piscator, Olshausen, comp. also Osiander) ; for in that mystical marriage-union Christ is the *Bridegroom*, filling the *man's* place, and hence the contrast to κολλ. τῇ πόρνῃ would be an unsuitable one. Olshausen's additional conjecture, that when the apostle spoke of τῇ πόρνῃ there floated before his mind a vision of the great whore who sitteth upon many waters (Rev. xvii. 1), is an empty fancy. — ἐν πνεύμα ἐστι] conceived of as the analogue to ἐν σῶμα. Comp. 2 Cor. iii. 17. This is the same Unio mystica which Jesus Himself so often demands in the Gospel of John, and in which no ethical diversity exists between the πνεῦμα of the believing man and the πνεῦμα of Christ which fills it ; Christ lives in the believer, Gal. ii. 20, as the believer in Christ, Gal. iii. 27, Col. iii. 17, this being brought about by Christ's communicating Himself to the human spirit through the

¹ To take it *impersonally*: "it is said," as in 2 Cor. x. 10, according to the well-known usage in the classics, would be without warrant from any other instance of Paul's

quotations from *Scripture*. Comp. Winer, *Gr.* p. 486 [E. T. 656] ; Buttmann, *neut. Gr.* p. 117 [E. T. 134].

power of the Holy Spirit, Rom. viii. 9–11. Now, be it observed how, by fleshly union with a harlot, this high and holy unity is not simply *put in hazard* (Hofmann), but excluded altogether as a moral *impossibility*! Comp. the idea of the impossibility of serving two masters (Rom. vi. 16), of fellowship with Christ and Belial, and the like. It is unnecessary to say that this has no application to union in marriage, seeing that it is ordained of God, “*ob verbum, quo actus concubialis sanctificatur*,” Calovius. Comp. Weiss, *bibl. Theol.* p. 421.

Vv. 18–20. Direct prohibition of fornication, strengthened by description of it as a sin against one’s own body, which is in fact the temple of the Holy Spirit, etc.

Ver. 18. Φεύγετε τὴν πορν.] Inferred from the foregoing verses (13–17), but expressed in all the more lively way from not being linked to them by any connective particle. “*Severitas cum fastidio*,” Bengel. — πᾶν ἁμάρτημα κ.τ.λ.] *asyndetic corroboration* of the preceding prohibition. Paul does not say anything here incapable of being maintained in its full stringency of meaning (Rückert, de Wette), nor is there any reason for taking πᾶν, with Michaelis, Flatt, Pott, and others, in a *popular* sense, as equivalent to *almost all* (comp. Theodore of Mopsuestia and Melancthon : “*cum quodam candore accipiatur de iis, quae saepius accidunt*”); but the truth of his words is based on the fact that every other sinful act (ἁμάρτημα), if it has to do at all with the body, works upon it from without, and consequently holds a position in reference to the body external to the same. The sinner makes that which is not of the body, but outside of it, as *e.g.* food and drink, to be the instrument of his immoral act, whereby the ἁμάρτημα, viewed in its relation to the body, comes to stand ἐκτὸς τοῦ σώματος, and has there the sphere of its occurrence and consummation. This holds true even in the case of the suicide, whose act is in fact a sinful use of external things, the instance of a man’s voluntarily starving himself not excepted (against Hofmann’s objection), for this is accomplished by the abuse of abstinence from food (which is equally an external relationship), and therefore ἐκτὸς τοῦ σώματος. How entirely different from the case of all such other sinful acts stands the state of things with unchasteness, where there is sin, not ἐκτὸς τ. σώματος, but εἰς τὸ ἴδιον σῶμα! See below. In connection with this passage, expositors indulge in many arbitrary and sometimes very odd interpretations ¹

¹ Chrysostom, Theophylact, Erasmus, *al.*, single out as the characteristic point—contrary to the literal tenor of the passage—the defilement of the *whole* body by fornication, on which ground a *bath* is taken subsequently. This latter point Theodoret also lays stress upon, explaining, however, the expression by the fact that the man who commits other sins οὐ τοσαύτην αἰσθησιν λαμβάνει τῆς ἁμαρτίας, while the profligate, on the other hand, εὐθύς μετὰ τὴν ἁμαρτίαν αἰσθάνεται τοῦ κακοῦ καὶ αὐτὸ τὸ σῶμα βδελύσσεται. Chrysostom’s interpretation of the *whole* body has been taken up again by Baur (in the *theol. Jahrb.* 1852, p. 540 f.).

The body *in its totality*, he holds, is meant, inasmuch as it is one body with the harlot, and in virtue of this unity the fornicator has the object of his sin not without himself, but in himself, and sins against the body identified with his own self. But all this *is not in the text*, and no reader could read it into the text. Hofmann, too, imports what is neither expressed in the words themselves nor suggested by the antithesis,—the obscure notion, namely, that, as in the case of the glutton, after completing the deed “*the thing of his sin does not remain with him*” (?).

and saving clauses. Among these must be reckoned the exposition of Calvin and others, *by way of comparison*: “*secundum plus et minus*.” Neander, too, imports a meaning which is not in the words, that fornication desecrates the body in its very *highest and most enduring significance* (namely, as the sum of the *personality*). According to Chr. F. Fritzsche (*Nova Opusc.* p. 249 f.), what is meant is that all other sins do not separate the body of the Christian from the body of Christ, this taking place only through fornication (ver. 15). But the general and local expression ἐκτὸς τ. σώματος ἐστίν does not correspond with this special and ethical reference, nor are we warranted in attributing to one of such ethical strictness as the apostle the conception that *no other* sin separates from the body of Christ, ver. 9 f.; Rom. viii. 9, *al.* — ὁ ἐὰν κ.τ.λ.] *which in any case whatever* (Hermann, *ad Viger.* p. 819) a man shall have committed. Respecting ἐάν, instead of ἄν, after relatives, see Winer, p. 291 [E. T. 390]. — ἐκτὸς τ. σώμ. ἐστίν] inasmuch as the sinful deed done *has been one brought about outside of the body*. — εἰς τὸ ἴδιον σῶμα] For his own bodily frame is the immediate object which he *affects in a sinful way*, whose moral purity and honour he hurts and wounds by his action. Comp. on εἰς, Luke xv. 18. He dishonours his own body, which is the organ and object of his sin. Comp. Beza. The apostle says nothing at all here of the *weakening effect* upon the body itself (Athanasius in Oecumenius, and others).

Ver. 19 justifies the ἀμαρτάνει in respect of the specific description of it given by εἰς τὸ ἴδιον σῶμα. “*Commits sin,*” I say, *against his own body*; or, in case ye doubt that, and think perhaps that it does not matter so much about the body, *know ye not that* (1) *your body* (*i.e.* the body of each one among you, see Bernhardt, p. 60) *is the temple* (not: *a temple*, see on iii. 16) *of the Holy Spirit which is in you* (Rom. viii. 11); and that (2) *ye belong not to your own selves* (see ver. 20)? Fornication, therefore, so far as it affects your own body, is a desecration of what is holy, and a selfish rebellion against God your Lord. — οὐ ἔχετε ἀπὸ Θεοῦ] gives edge to the proof,¹ and leads on to the second point (οὐκ ἐστὲ ἐαυτῶν). Οὐ is under attraction from ἀγ. πν. (Winer, p. 154 [E. T. 203]). — καὶ οὐκ κ.τ.λ.] still dependent upon ὅτι, which is to be supplied again after καί, not an independent statement (Hofmann, who takes the καί as meaning *also*), which would needlessly interrupt the flow of the animated address.

Ver. 20. *For* (proof of the οὐκ ἐστὲ ἐαυτ.) *ye were bought*, *i.e.* redeemed from the curse of the law, Gal. iii. 13; from the wrath of God, Eph. ii. 3; from the bond of the guilt of sin, Rom. iii. 19–21; and acquired as God’s property (Eph. ii. 19, i. 14), *for a price*, which was paid to God for your reconciliation with Him, namely, the blood of Christ, Matt. xxvi. 28; Rom. iii. 24 f.; 2 Cor. v. 18 ff.; Eph. i. 7; 1 Pet. i. 18 f.; Rev. v. 9. We have the same conception in Acts xx. 28, although there, as also in 1 Cor. vii. 23, and Tit. ii. 14, the church is represented as the property of

¹ Chrysostom: καὶ τὸν δεδωκότα τέθεικεν, ὑψηλὸν τε ὁμοῦ ποιῶν τὸν ἀκροατὴν, καὶ φοβῶν καὶ τῷ μεγέθει τῆς παρακαταθήκης καὶ τῇ φιλοτιμίᾳ τοῦ παρακαταθεμένου. Further, as to

the idea of the body being the temple of the Holy Spirit, in opposition to the abuse of it in debauchery, comp. Herm. *Past.* Sim. v. 7.

Christ; but see John xvii. 9. — *τιμῆς*] strengthens the *ἡγοράσθ.* as the opposite of acquiring without an equivalent. Comp. vii. 23. The *common* exposition (following the Vulgate): *magno pretio*, inserts without warrant what is not in the text (so, too, Pott, Flatt, Rückert, Osiander, Olshausen, Ewald).¹ Comp. Herod. vii. 119, and the passages in Wetstein; and see already Valla. — *δοξάσατε δὴ κ.τ.λ.*] *Do but glorify*, etc. This is the moral obligation arising out of the *two* things grasped by faith as certainties, ver. 19. Regarding the *δὴ* of urgency with imperatives, see on Acts xiii. 2. — *ἐν τῷ σώμ. ὑμ.*] not instrumental, nor as in Phil. i. 20 (comp. Rom. xii. 1), but so expressed, because the exhortation proceeds upon the footing of the whole tenor of ver. 19, in which the body is described as a *temple*; *in your body*, namely, practically by chastity, the opposite of which would be an *ἀτιμάζειν τὸν Θεόν* (Rom. ii. 23) in His own sanctuary!

NOTES BY AMERICAN EDITOR.

(o) *The Judging of angels.* Ver. 3.

The author is undoubtedly correct in saying that here, according to the constant usage of Scripture, good angels are meant; but he speaks rashly in holding that the distinctions among them ("principalities, powers," etc.) are made upon ethical grounds. Not a hint of this is given in the Bible, where throughout the entire body, when described at all, is noted as holy. It is far more natural to suppose that these creatures of God, like all other intelligent creatures of whom we have knowledge, differ in capacity, and therefore occupy different positions and render different services. The difficulty in the passage which arises to most readers at first blush is obviated by the unity of Christ with his church triumphant—a thought which is ever present to the Apostle's mind when he thinks of the future. In this sense redeemed humanity will be the judge of the spiritual world and of whatever it contains. This is aided by the consideration Hodge advances, that to rule and to judge are often in Scripture convertible terms. To rule Israel and to judge Israel mean the same thing. Thus is explained the promise to the apostles in Matt. xix. 18, of "sitting upon twelve thrones and judging the twelve tribes of Israel." So in the present case, "Know ye not that we shall judge angels?" is equivalent to "Know ye not that we are to be exalted above the angels and preside over them; shall we not then preside over earthly things?"

(p) *Going to law before unbelievers.* Ver. 6.

A litigious spirit is known to have characterized the Greek nation from the time of Aristophanes downwards; and it is not wonderful that this should have cropped out in the Christians of Corinth. What the Apostle reproves is that believers, instead of settling their disputes among themselves, dragged one another before a heathen tribunal, and so brought discredit upon themselves and the worthy name by which they were called. That this does not teach that believers now are never to appeal to a civil court is obvious, because such courts are in no

¹ How *high* a price it was (1 Pet. i. 19) would suggest itself readily to the readers, but is not implied in the word itself.

sense heathen, and Paul himself did not hesitate to invoke the protection of the laws of the land against the injustice of his countrymen. But it does teach with emphasis the wrongfulness and the meanness of cherishing a litigious spirit.

(Q) "*Ye were washed.*" Ver. 11.

It does not seem at all necessary to interpret this of baptism, as the author does. It may indeed have an allusion to the rite, but is certainly not formally identified with it. The figure contained in the word is one often occurring in Scripture—Ps. li. 7 ; Isa. i. 16 ; Rev. xxii. 14 (true text). All three expressions are to be taken simply as a varied utterance of the same truth, and their force is well given by Stanley thus: "*Ye were washed, and so cannot be again unclean ; consecrated, and so cannot be again polluted ; made righteous, and so cannot be unrighteous.*" The attempt of Hodge and others to make the last verb mean forensic justification is inconsistent with its position here, for according to the Apostle's doctrine everywhere, sanctification and moral cleansing follow justification, and are dependent upon it, while here they would be represented as conditioning it, which is simply impossible.

CHAPTER VII.

Ver. 3. ὀφειλὴν] Elz. and Matt. read ὀφειλομένην εὐνοίαν, against decisive evidence. Erroneous explanation. — Ver. 5. Τῇ νηστείᾳ καὶ after σχολάσητε (not σχολάζητε, Elz.) is an inappropriate addition in the ascetic interest; and συνέρχεσθε, in place of ἦτε, is a gloss. — Ver. 7. γάρ] A C D* F G S*, min. It. Copt. Goth. and several Fathers have δέ. Approved by Griesb., and adopted by Lachm. Tisch. and Rück. The γάρ was an incorrect gloss upon the δέ. — Instead of ὅς . . . ὅς, read, with Lachm. and Tisch., following the majority of the uncials, ὁ . . . ὁ. In ver. 10 again, Lachm. and Rück. put χωρίζεσθαι in place of χωρίσθῃναι (with A D E F G); but, considering the weight of authority on the other side, ἀφιέναι must dissuade us from the change. — Ver. 13. οὗτος] approved also by Griesb., adopted by Lachm. Rück. and Tisch. The evidence against αὐτός (Elz.) is conclusive. But this induces us to read αὕτη in ver. 12 also (with Lachm. Tisch. and Rück.). — αὐτόν] Lachm. Tisch. and Rück. have τὸν ἄνδρα, approved by Griesb. also, and on conclusive grounds. Αὐτόν has crept in from uniformity to ver. 12. Had there been a gloss, we should have found a corresponding variation of αὐτήν in ver. 12 as well. — Ver. 14. ἀνδρί] The uncials from A to G, S*, Copt. Baschm. It. Jerome, and Augustine, read ἀδελφῶ. Recommended by Griesb., adopted by Lachm. Rück. and Tisch. Ἀνδρί is an explanatory addition. — Ver. 15. ἡμᾶς] Tisch. has ὑμᾶς, but the evidence for it is weaker; and ὑμᾶς would easily come in from ver. 14. — Ver. 17. Κύριος] Elz. and Matt. read Θεός, and, after κέκληκεν : ὁ Κύριος. Against conclusive testimony; Κύριος was glossed and dislodged by Θεός, and then afterwards reinserted in the wrong place. Hence in G, Boern. we have ὁ Κύριος . . . ὁ Κύριος ὁ Θεός. — Ver. 18. Instead of the second τις ἐκλήθη, Lachm. Tisch. and Rück. read κέκλεται τις, with A B S, min., and additional support from D* F and G, which have τις κέκλ. The *Recepta* is a mechanical repetition from the first clause of the verse. — Ver. 28. γήμης] B S have γαμήσης; and, since in A we have γαμήση, and in D E F G ἁββης γυναιῖκα, which is plainly a gloss, the evidence preponderates in favour of γαμήσης (Lachm. Tisch.); γήμης arose out of what follows. — Ver. 29.¹ After ἀδελφοί Elz. has ὅτι, against A B K L S, min. Baschm. Syr. p. Vulg. Eus. Method. Basil, Theodoret, Hierat. *al.* An exegetical addition. — τὸ λοιπὸν ἐστίν] A B S, min. Copt. Syr. p. Arm. Slav. Eus. Ephr. Basil, Cyr. have ἐστὶ τὸ λοιπόν. Now, seeing that D* has simply ἐστὶ λοιπόν, and F G 67** Boern. Vulg. Method. Tert. Jerome, Ambrosiast. *al.* have ἐστί, λοιπὸν ἐστίν, the reading of A, etc., is best accredited. That in the Received text originated in the wish to indicate the fact that τὸ λοιπόν was regarded as belonging to what had gone before,—a connection which is expressly set forth in several codd. vss. and Fathers (see Tisch. and Reiche). As to whether a comma should be placed between ἐστίν and τὸ λοιπόν, which is done by Lachm. Tisch. Rück. and Scholz, see the exegetical remarks on the verse. — Ver. 31. τῷ

¹ Respecting ver. 29, see Reiche, *comment. crit.* I. p. 178 ff.

κοσμῷ τούτῳ] Lachm. Tisch. and Rück. read τὸν κόσμον, with A B $\aleph$, also D* F G 17, which, however, add τοῦτον. The dative was a correction to bring it into accordance with the common usage; τοῦτον (τούτῳ) again in addition from what follows. — Vv. 32–34. ἀρέσει] Lachm. and Rück. have ἀρέσῃ, with A B D E F G $\aleph$ 21 46, Eus. *al.* But it was very natural that, in place of the future (K L, almost all the min. Clem. Or. Meth. Ath. Epiph. and many others), the more usual subjunctive should creep into the text. — Ver. 34.¹ μεμέρισται κ.τ.λ.] Καὶ μεμέρισται occurs in A B D* $\aleph$, min. Syr. p. Copt. Vulg. Cyr. Jerome, and many other Fathers, and is joined to what precedes it by most of the codd. Copt. Vulg. Cyr. Jerome (who expressly states that this connection is according to the original), Pel. Bede, *al.* On the other hand, it is construed with what follows by Syr. Arr. Arm. It. Chrys. Theodoret, Basil, Oecum. Theophylact, Tert. Ambr. Aug. Sedul. and Latin codices in Jerome. The καὶ after μεμέρ., which is wanting in Elz., is conclusively attested by A B D*** F G K L $\aleph$, min. Aeth. Vulg. It. Chrys. *al.* Going on with the verse, we find ἡ ἄγαμος after γυνή in A B $\aleph$, some min. Vulg. and several Fathers; while, on the other hand, there is no ἡ ἄγαμος after παρθένος in Vulg. Jerome, Aug. Euseb. *al.* We have the choice left us, therefore, between the following two readings (and modes of connecting the words): (1) [καὶ] μεμέρισται καὶ ἡ γυνή καὶ ἡ παρθένος· ἡ ἄγαμος μεριμνᾷ κ.τ.λ., and (2) καὶ μεμέρισται. Καὶ ἡ γυνή ἡ ἄγαμος καὶ ἡ παρθένος ἡ ἄγαμος μεριμνᾷ κ.τ.λ. The latter is adopted by Lachm. and Rück.; but is not to be preferred, because it offers no difficulty whatever, and, consequently, no occasion for any change. The former, on the contrary (found in D*** F G K L, and many min. It. Slav. Chrys. Theodoret, Dam.), presented a stone of stumbling in the μεμέρισται, which was either not understood at all, or misunderstood. Where not understood, it was left out altogether (so even Cyprian: “uxori. Sic et mulier et virgo innupta cogitat,” etc.); where misunderstood (that μερίζεσθαι must mean *curis distrahi*, see Jerome, *adv. Jovin.* i. 7), it was connected with the preceding clause by καὶ (which appears, therefore, to be spurious). This made γυνή be taken as *mulier vidua* (Aeth.); and hence ἡ ἄγαμος was either pushed forward (Vulg.), or else left in connection with παρθένος, and the same word added to γυνή as well (A B $\aleph$, Lachm.). Scholz, too, has the words as in our reading,² but spoils it by his quite wrong and abrupt method of punctuation: τῇ γυναικί· μεμέρισται. Καὶ ἡ γυνή καὶ ἡ παρθένος ἡ ἄγαμος μεριμνᾷ κ.τ.λ. — Ver. 34. τὰ τοῦ κόσμου] omitted in B alone, which, however, is approved of by Buttmann (*Studien u. Krit.* 1860, p. 370). — Ver. 37. ἐδραῖος ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ] Lachm. reads ἐν τῇ καρδ. αὐτοῦ ἐδραῖος, which has conclusive evidence in its favour; on the other hand, there is no sufficient ground for omitting ἐδρ. (as Griesb. does) or αὐτοῦ (deleted by Tisch.). As regards ἐδραῖος in particular, which is omitted only by F G, It. Aeth., it was very likely to be left out as being unessential, so far as the sense was concerned, after ἐστηκεν. — αὐτοῦ τοῦ] is deleted by Lachm. Rück. and Tisch. in accordance with A B $\aleph$. In place of it, Tisch., following the same authorities, has ἐν τῇ ἰδίᾳ καρδίᾳ. The evidence, however, for αὐτοῦ τοῦ (the uncials D E F G K L) is too weighty and uniform, while τοῦ again was in appearance so cumbrous and superfluous, and such a natural occasion for writing ἰδίᾳ instead of αὐτοῦ presented itself in the

¹ Respecting ver. 34, see Reiche, *Comment. crit.* I. p. 184 ff.

² It is defended also by Reiche and retain-

ed by Tisch. Elz. varies from it only in omitting the καὶ after μεμέρισται, which was justly reinserted by Bengel.

preceding ἰδίου θελήμ., that our conclusion is to retain the *Recepta*. — Instead of ποιεῖ, A B $\aleph$ 6 17 37, Copt. have ποιήσει (as also where it occurs for the second time in ver. 38), which is adopted by Lachm. and Rück. (B 6 17 37 have ποιήσει also the first time in ver. 38). But in default of internal reasons for a change, these witnesses, having no support from the Fathers, and next to none from the vss., are too weak to warrant it. — Ver. 38. ὁ ἐκγαμίζων] Lachm. and Rück. have ὁ γαμίζων τὴν παρθένον ἑαυτοῦ. Now it is true that γαμίζων occurs in A B D E $\aleph$ 17 23 31 46, Clem. Method. Basil., and τὴν παρθ. ἑαυτ. (or τ. ἑαυτ. παρθ., so Rück.) in much the same codices and Syr. Erp. Arm. Baschm. Aeth. Vulg. Clar. Germ. Clem. Basil. *al*. But the whole reading is manifestly of the nature of a gloss, ἐκγαμίζων, being explained sometimes by γαμίζων τὴν παρθ. ἑαυτ., sometimes by the addition to it of τὴν παρθ. ἑαυτ. The latter phrase crept into the text *beside* ἐκγαμ., the former *in place* of it. — Instead of ὁ δέ read καὶ ὁ; so Griesb. Lachm. Schulz, Rück. Tisch., upon conclusive evidence. The antithesis gave rise to the ὁ δέ. — Ver. 39. After δέδεταί Elz. has νόμω, against A B D* F^a 1 $\aleph$ **, min. with many vss. and Fathers. Taken from Rom. vii. 2, although Reiche doubts this. — ἔαν δέ] Tisch. has ἔαν δὲ καί, upon insufficient evidence; the καί might easily come in through writing the next syllable twice over, or by a clerical error such as κεκοιμηθῇ (so F G).

CONTENTS.—Instructions regarding marriage, matrimonial intercourse, and divorce (vv. 1–17); then an excursus upon the theme that the reception of Christianity ought not to alter the outward relations of life (vv. 17–24); lastly, about virgins—as to how far celibacy in general is advisable for both sexes (vv. 25–34), and whether a father does better to let his daughter remain single, or give her away in marriage (vv. 35–38). The same advice, to remain unmarried, is given to widows (ver. 39 f.). Comp. on this chapter, Harless, *die Ehescheidungsfrage*, 1861.

Ver. 1. Δέ] leads over to the answering of questions put in the letter from Corinth. — ἐγράψατέ μοι] Differences of opinion must have prevailed respecting the points discussed in this chapter, and these had been laid before the apostle by the church. In particular, there must have been at Corinth opponents of marriage. This is wrongly denied by Baur, who imagines merely an attempt made among the Corinthians to defend fornication from the analogy of marriage; of which there is not a trace in the apostle's words. Whether, now, the doubts in question, more especially as to the lawfulness of marriage,² were mixed up with the *subsistence of the parties* at Corinth, it is impossible to make out with any certainty, although in itself it seems likely that a matter of opinion so important practically would be turned, with other points, to account in the interest of party. Grotius holds that those who raised such points of debate were “*sub Christianorum*

¹ Fragment of a Codex of the 7th century. See Tisch. *Monum. sacr. ined.* p. 460.

² If the opinion that fornication was lawful (vi. 12 ff.) arose at Corinth out of an Epicurean libertinism, the doubts regarding the lawfulness of marriage must have flowed from the opposite source, to wit,

from the perverted moral extravagance of others, who, because of the intercourse of sex involved, counted marriage also an impure thing, and would have the maxim: καλὸν ἀνθρώπῳ γυναικὸς μὴ ἄπτεσθαι, to be of absolute and universal application.

nomine philosophi verius quam Christiani." But such of the Greek philosophers as advocated views adverse to marriage did so upon the ground of the *cares* and *dangers* connected with marriage (see Grotius *in loc.*), not from any doubt regarding its *morality*, as, according to vv. 28, 36, must have been the case among the Corinthians. Further, it is certain that the adversaries of marriage could *not* be of the *Petrine party*; for Peter himself was married (Matt. viii. 14; 1 Cor. ix. 5), and the Judaizing tendency, which cannot be proved to have had an Essene-Ebionitic character in Corinth (Schwegler, I. p. 163 f.¹), could be nothing else but favourable to marriage (see Lightfoot, *Horae*, p. 189). Olshausen (comp. also Jaeger, Kniewel, Goldhorn, Ewald) decides for the *Christ-party*, in whose idealistic tendency he considers there were contained the germs both of moral indifference and of false asceticism. But this party's idealism in general is a pure hypothesis, which is as little established by proof as their *Essenism* in particular, to which Ewald traces back the rejection of marriage among the Corinthians.² In the last place, that it was the *followers of Paul* (Storr, Rosenmüller, Flatt, Pott, Neander, Rübiger, Osiander, Maier, Rückert refuses to give a decision), who—in opposition, perhaps, to the Petrine party, and appealing to the celibacy of Paul himself, he never having been married (see on ver. 8)—overvalued celibacy, and pronounced marriage to stand lower in point of morality and holiness, is the most likely view, for this reason, that the apostle's sentiments upon this point were in themselves, as we see from the chapter before us, quite of a kind to be readily misunderstood or misinterpreted by many of his disciples—more especially in partisan interests—as being unfavourable to marriage.³ It merely required that men should overlook or wish to overlook the *conditional* character of the advantages which he ascribes to single life. The opponents of marriage referred to in 1 Tim. iv. 3 were of a totally different class. Those with whom we are now concerned did not forbid marriage and so endanger Christian liberty (otherwise Paul would have written regarding them in quite another tone), but simply undervalued it, placing it morally *below* celibacy, and advising against it, hence, too, as respects married persons, favouring a cessation from matrimonial intercourse and even divorce (vv. 3 ff., 10 ff.). — καλὸν ἀνθρώπων] With respect to what you have written to me (περὶ κ.τ.λ., absolute, as in xvi. 1, 12; Bernhardt, p. 261; Bremi, *ad De-*

¹ One section of the Essenes even declared itself against celibacy, Josephus, *Bell.* ii. 8. 13; Ritschl, *altkath. Kirche*, p. 185.

² According to Ewald (comp. too, his *Gesch. der apost. Zeit.* p. 503 f.), the Christ-party appealed to the *example of Christ* in regard to this point especially. But had that been the case, we should surely have found some traces of it in Paul's way of discussing the question, whereas, on the contrary, the reference which he deems it due to make is rather to *his own example* (ver. 7). Looking at the matter as a whole, it is *prima facie* improbable that any one

should have adduced the unwedded life of Christ as an argument against marriage—in the first place, because He, as the incarnate Son of God, held too lofty a place in the believing consciousness to present a standard for such earthly relationships; and secondly, because He Himself in His teaching had so strongly upheld the sanctity of marriage.

³ Just as they were often misinterpreted, as is well known, in after times in the interests of the celibate system, of nunneries and monasteries.

mosth. Ol. p. 194 ; Maetzner, *ad Antiph.* p. 170), *it is good for a man*, etc., that is to say : *it is morally salutary*¹ *for an (unmarried) man not to touch a woman*. That, in a general theoretical point of view, is the prevailing axiom, which I hereby enunciate as my decision ; but in a practical point of view, seeing that few have the gift of continence, the precept must come in : because of fornication, etc., ver. 2. In Paul's eyes, therefore, the *γυναικὸς μὴ ἄπτεσθαι* is, indeed, something morally salutary in and by itself ; but this affirmation, made from a general point of view, finds its necessary limitation and restriction in the actual facts of the case, so that just according to circumstances marriage may be equally a duty. Hence the *καλὸν κ.τ.λ.* is not appropriate for the defence of celibacy in general ("si bonum est mulierem non tangere, malum ergo est tangere," Jerome, *ad Jovin.* i. 4, and see especially Cornelius à Lapide *in loc.*). — ἄπτεσθαι, like *tangere* in the sense of *sexual intercourse* (Gen. xx. 16, xxi. 11 ; Prov. vi. 29). See Wetstein and Kypke, II. p. 204 f. Marriage is the particular case coming under this general *γυναικὸς ἄπτεσθαι*, to be treated of in detail hereafter. Rückert, failing to recognize this progress in the apostle's argument (so, too, Kling in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1839, p. 444), holds that the reference is to sexual intercourse in *marriages already formed* (and that nothing is said of *entering into* matrimonial connections). Did Paul, as Kling supposes, here give it as his opinion that "*a chaste life, as of brother and sister*, was more consonant, on the part of married persons, with delicacy of moral feeling" (*καλόν*) ; this would be a sentimental error, which ought not to be attributed to him, whether considered in itself, or in view of his high appreciation of marriage as a union of the sexes (2 Cor. xi. 2 ; Rom. vii. 4 ; Eph. v. 28 ff.). — The axiom is enunciated *without a μέν*, because it is, in the first place, *conceived simply in itself* ; the limitation which follows is *added* with *δέ* by way of antithesis. Comp. on Eph. v. 8, and Fritzsche, *ad Rom.* II. p. 433. Precisely so, too, in ver. 8.

Ver. 2. *In order, however, that offences in the way of fornication* (see on this plural of the abstract, Kühner, II. p. 28 ; Maetzn. *ad Lycurg.* p. 144 f.) *may be avoided in practice, the rule holds good : Let every man have*² *a wife of his own* (properly belonging to himself in marriage), etc. — On *διά*, comp. Winer, p. 372 [E. T. 497]. Rückert, de Wette, and Maier are wrong in maintaining that *ἔχέτω* is *permissive* merely,—Rückert, indeed, making it so only to the extent of a man's *retaining* his wife. The latter is disproved by vv. 9, 10, and the former by the fact that the immediately following *ἀποιδότω* in ver. 3 is not to be taken as permissive, any more than the *γαμησάτωσαν* which answers to *ἔχέτω* in ver. 9. It is opposed, further, by the consideration that *διὰ τὰς πορνείας* is a determining element of a *moral* kind, which must therefore necessarily lead not to a mere permissibility, but to a positive

¹ That we have in *καλὸν κ.τ.λ.* a moral axiom, a statement of what is *ethically* salutary, not a mere utilitarian principle of practical prudence, is clear, especially from the comparison in the last clause of ver. 9, and from vv. 32–34, where the ethical benefit of it is explained. [See the limitation of *καλόν* in ver. 26, where the reason is formal-

ly stated.—T. W. C.]

² This *ἔχειν* is nothing else but the simple *habere* (to possess) ; it does not mean *intercourse in marriage*, which ought to be *continued* (Kling, Heydenreich, following Cameron and Estius). Paul comes to that only in ver. 3.

obligation (already noted by Erasmus). This injunction, however, is a moral rule, to which exceptions may occur from higher considerations in cases where no danger of fornication is apprehended and there is the “*donum continentiae*,” as Paul himself had shown by his own example,—in which, nevertheless, no support whatever is given to any sort of celibacy *enforced by law*, a thing which, on the contrary, our text decidedly dis-
countenances. Rückert thinks further that Paul exhibits here a very poor opinion of marriage ; and Baur (in the *theol. Jahrb.* 1852, p. 15 ff.) has more fully developed this idea so as to assert that the apostle's view of marriage is at variance with the moral conception of it which now prevails.¹ Comp. also Rothe, *Ethik*, III. p. 614. But can it be true, then, that *he*, who looked upon the union with Christ itself as the analogue of wedded life, valued marriage only as a “*temperamentum continentiae*”? No ! what he does is this : out of all the different grounds on which marriage rested in his mind, he selects just that one which, in the first place, specially concerned his readers (remember the *κορινθιάζεσθαι*), and in the second place, had peculiar weight in connection with the nearness of the Parousia. That approaching catastrophe might furnish him with sufficient reasons for leaving unmentioned those higher ends of marriage which reached forth into a more remote future, and confining himself to the immediate practical relations of the brief, momentous present. See ver. 26 ff. Keeping in view the present *ἀνάγκη*, the near approach of the Lord, and the necessity, therefore, of an undivided surrender to Him, Paul had, *under these given circumstances*, recognized in the state of single life what in and by itself was *καλὸν ἀνθρώπῳ*, *if only no fornication and heat were conjoined therewith*. It is from *this* point of view, which was presented to him by the *then existing condition of things* (and hence without at all contradicting Gen. ii. 18), that the apostle handles the subject, discussing it accordingly in a special aspect and from one particular side, while the wider and higher moral relations of marriage lie beyond the limits of what he has now in hand.—Observe, further, how sharply and decisively the expression in ver. 2 (comp. Eph. v. 22, 25) excludes not only concubinage and sexual intercourse apart from marriage generally, but also all polygamy.

Vv. 3, 4. The *occasion* for this injunction, which otherwise might very well have been dispensed with, must have been given by the statement in the letter from Corinth of scruples having arisen on the point. See on ver. 1. — τὴν ὀφειλὴν] *the due in the matter* (Rom. xiii. 7), *i.e.* according to the context, as euphemistically expressed, the *debitum tori*.² See ver. 4. The word does not occur at all in Greek writers ; see Lobeck, *ad Phryn.* p. 90. Nor does it in the LXX. and the Apocrypha. — ἡ γυνὴ τοῦ ἰδίου σώμ. κ.τ.λ.]

¹ Comp. in opposition to this, Ernesti, *Ethik des Ap. Paulus*, p. 115 f.

² If we adopted the common reading τὴν ὀφειλομ. εὐνοίαν, we should not take it, with Grotius, *al.*, in the same sense as given above, but generally, with Calvin and others, as *benevolentiam*. For the expression for that special idea is not εὐνοία (not even

in Philo, *de Abr.* p. 584), but φιλότης (Homer). μίξις, συνουσία. The author of the gloss, therefore, must either have misunderstood τὴν ὀφειλὴν, or, understanding it rightly, have used a wrong expression to explain it. The reading ὀφειλομένην τιμὴν in Chrysostom points to the former alternative.

Explanatory of ver. 3. *The wife has no power over her own body*, namely, as regards cohabitation, *but the husband has that power* ; likewise (ὁμοίως) *also, on the other hand*, the converse holds, so that “*neutri liceat alteri conjugale debitum poscenti denegare*,” Estius. Corresponding statements of the Rabbins may be seen in Selden, *uxor. Hebr.* iii. 6. 7. — Bengel says happily respecting ἰδίου, that it forms with οὐκ ἐξουσιάζει an *elegans paradoxon*.

Ver. 5. *Withhold not yourselves from each other, unless it were perhaps (nisi forte, comp. 2 Cor. xiii. 5 ; Luke ix. 13) that ye did so as occasion emerged (ἄν), by agreement for a time (supply ἀποστερήτε ἀλλήλ. ; see on Luke ix. 13).* The obvious meaning is euphemistically expressed by ἀποστερ. ; ἄγαν τοίνυν ἀρμοδίως τοῦτο τέθεικεν ἐπὶ τῶν οὐ συμφώνως τὴν ἐγκράτειαν αἰρουμένων, Theodoret. — ἵνα σχολάσητε κ.τ.λ.] *ἵνα* introduces the *design* of the concession just made ἐκ συμφών. πρὸς καιρόν : *in order that ye may have free leisure for prayer*—may be able to give yourselves to it without being drawn away and distracted by sensual desire and the pleasures of sense. What Paul means is not the ordinary praying of the Christian heart, which ought to ascend ἀδιαλείπτως (1 Thess. v. 17 ; Eph. vi. 18), but such *extraordinary exercises in prayer* as they might have determined specially to devote themselves to for a longer period (a series of days). We are not to assume that such domestic devotions, as the apostle here plainly supposes to be engaged in by husband and wife in common, had been already then connected with Christian *festivals* ; probably they were still entirely dependent upon the wants and wishes of individuals. But the idea of cohabitation being excluded for a time by religious exercises, is found both among the Jews (Ex. xix. 15 ; 1 Sam. xxi. 4) and the heathen. See Wetstein and Dougt. *Anal.* II. p. 111 f. Comp. *Test. XII. Patr.* p. 673 : καιρὸς γὰρ συνουσίας γυναικὸς αὐτοῦ, καὶ καιρὸς ἐγκρατείας εἰς προσευχὴν αὐτοῦ. — καὶ πάλιν ἦτε] still dependent on ἵνα, indicates σεμνῶς the being together again for matrimonial intercourse. With respect to ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό,¹ comp. on Acts i. 15. — ἵνα μὴ πειράζῃ κ.τ.λ.] *design* of the καὶ πάλιν . . . ἦτε : *in order that Satan may not tempt you to sin* (to breach of the marriage-vow) *on account of your incontinency*, because ye are incontinent ; for “*Satanas vitiorum scintillas excitat*,” Grotius. Ἀκρασία, which occurs again in the N. T. in its older form of ἀκράτεια, Matt. xxiii. 25, comes from ἀκρατής (κρατεῖν), and is the opposite of ἐγκράτεια. See Lobeck, *ad Phryn.* p. 524 ; Stallbaum, *ad Plat. Rep.* p. 461 B. Rückert conjectures that the word means : *not mingling in matrimonial intercourse (on account of your non-participation therein)*. This is quite against usage ; for ἀκρᾶσία (with the α long, from ἄκρατος), in the Ionic form ἀκρησίη, means *bad mixture*, as opposed to εὐκρασία. See Theophrastus, *c. pl.* iii. 2. 5 ; Dio Cassius, lxxvii. 22. Paul had reason enough to affirm *incontinency* of the Corinthians generally, and to call their attention in warning to this *lack of moral strength*, on which the devil would base his attempts to find access to them with his temptations. Comp. 2 Cor. ii. 11.

* Ver. 6. Τοῦτο] does not refer to what follows (J. Cappellus, Rosenmüller), which it does not suit ; nor to ver. 2 (Beza, Grotius, de Wette, Gratama,

¹ Erasmus remarks rightly : “*ut intelligas, eos ante fuisse separatos thalamis.*”

Baur, Hofmann) ; nor to all that has been said from ver. 2 onwards (Bengel, Pott, Flatt, Billroth, Rückert, Osiander), for vv. 2-4 contain precepts actually obligatory ; nor to κ. πάλιν ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ ἦτε (Origen, Tertullian, Jerome, Cornelius à Lapide, *al.*), which is but a subordinate *portion* of the preceding utterance. It is to this utterance : μὴ ἀποστερεῖτε . . . ἀκρ. ὑμῶν, which directly precedes the τοῦτο, that it can alone be made to refer without arbitrariness,—an utterance which might have the appearance of an ἐπιταγή, but is not intended to be such. What Paul means is this : Although I say that ye should withhold yourselves from each other by mutual agreement only perhaps for the season of prayer, and then come together again, so as to escape the temptations of Satan ; yet that is not to be understood *by way of command*, as if you might not be abstinent at other times or for a longer period ἐκ συμφώνου, but *by way of indulgence* (“*secundum indulgentiam*,” Vulgate), so that thereby *concession is made* to your lack of continency, it is allowed for. Theophylact puts it well : συγκαταβαίνων τῇ ἀσθενείᾳ ὑμῶν, and Erasmus : “*consulo vestris periculis*.” — συγγνώμη occurs here only in the N. T. (Ecclus., pref. i. and iii. 13), but very often in Greek writers,—not, however, in the LXX. It means invariably either *forgiveness*, or, as here, *forbearance, indulgence*, γνώμη κριτικὴ τοῦ ἐπιεικοῦς ὀρθή, Aristotle, *Eth.* vi. 11. Hammond and Pott transgress the laws of the language by making it the same as κατὰ τὴν ἐμὴν γνώμην. So even Valckenaer ; comp. Calovius, Flatt, Heydenreich, *al.* Ewald, too, renders without any support from the usage of the language : “*with the best conscience*.”

Ver. 7. I do not say *by way of command* that you should withhold yourselves only for the time of prayer and then be together again ; *but indeed* (δέ) *I wish* that every one had the gift of continency, as I myself, and so could restrain himself, not merely at such isolated periods for some particular higher end ; still (and that justifies what I said : κατὰ συγγνώμην) this gift is not vouchsafed to all. There is no more ground for supposing that μέν should be supplied (after λέγω) in connection with this δέ, than there is in ver. 2 (against Rückert). — ὡς καὶ ἐμαυτόν] *as also I myself*, that is to say, *endued with the donum continentiae*, ἐν ἐγκρατείᾳ, Chrysostom. See what follows. He does not mean his state of single life, but its charismatic *basis*. The καί is, as for instance in Acts xxvi. 29, the quite commonly used καί of comparison. — χάρισμα] *a special endowment bestowed by divine grace, fitting him for the purposes of the kingdom of God*. Comp. on xii. 1-4 ; Rom. xii. 6. It is of course, and necessarily (because communicated through the Spirit), conceived as existing *within* the church. The words πάντα ἀνθρώπων do not contradict this ; for Paul could most warrantably wish *to all men* that gracious gift, which he as a *Christian* was conscious that he possessed, and as to which he knew that even within the Christian pale it was vouchsafed to one and withheld from another. — ὁ μὲν οὕτως κ.τ.λ.] is not to be understood as if the first οὕτως meant the gift of continence, and the second a man's suitableness for wedded life (de Wette, with older commentators, beginning with Theodoret and Theophylact), but in a quite *general* sense : the one has his peculiar gift of grace *after this fashion*, the other *in that* ; the one *so*, the other *so*. Under this general statement, the possession

of continence, or some other gracious endowment in its place, is *included*. As to the double οὕτως, comp. LXX. 2 Sam. xi. 25 : ποτὲ μὲν οὕτως καὶ ποτὲ οὕτως καταφάγεται ἡ ῥομφαία, also Judg. xviii. 4 ; 2 Kings v. 4 ; 2 Sam. xvii. 15. It is not so used in Greek writers.

Vv. 8, 9. Λέγω δέ] leads on from what is contained in ver. 7 (from the subjective *wish* of the apostle and its objective limitation) to the *rules* flowing therefrom, which he has now to *enunciate*. Rückert holds that the transition here made by Paul is from the married to the unmarried. But were that the case, τοῖς δὲ ἀγάμοις would require to stand first (comp. ver. 10) ; the emphasis is on λέγω. — τοῖς ἀγάμοις] what is meant is the whole category, *all without distinction*, including *both* sexes, not simply *widowers* ;¹ for the phrase opposed to it, τοῖς γεγαμηκόσι, in ver. 10, embraces *both* sexes ; and hence ἀγάμ. cannot apply to the *unmarried men* alone (Rückert). The additional clause, κ. ταῖς χήραις, by no means justifies a restrictive rendering ; for in it the καὶ does not mean *also* (Hofmann), but, as the connective *and*, singles out specially from the general expression something already included in it : *and in particular* the widows. The idiom is an ordinary one both in classical and N. T. Greek (Matt. viii. 33 ; Mark xvi. 7 ; and often elsewhere) ; see Fritzsche, *ad Marc.* p. 11, 713. Comp. here Soph. *O. R.* 1502 : χέρσους φθαρῆναι καγάμους. It was a special wish of Paul's, therefore, that the *widows* should remain unwedded, doubtless in the interests of the church (Rom. xvi. 1 ; 1 Tim. v. 9 ff.). — καλὸν (as in ver. 1) αὐτοῖς, *sc. ἐστι* ; comp. ver. 40. — ἐὰν μείνωσιν κ.τ.λ.] *if they shall have remained as I also (have remained)*, *i.e.* unmarried. The opposite of this is γαμησάτωσαν, ver. 9. The ὡς καγὼ therefore receives here from the context a different meaning than in ver. 7. Luther, Grotius, and others infer from this passage that Paul was a widower ;² so, too, Ewald. But this conclusion rests upon the assumption, which is linguistically inadmissible, that ἀγάμοις denotes widowers alone (*i.e.* χῆροι) ; and, moreover, would not be a safe inference even were the assumption sound. Acts vii. 58, moreover, is against this ; for one could not place Paul's marriage *after* the stoning of Stephen. — οὐκ ἐγκρατεύονται] to be closely joined together : *are incontinent*. See Hartung, *Partikell.* II. p. 122 ; Maetzner, *ad Antiph.* p. 267 ; Ameis on *Hom. Od.* ii. 274. The verb ἐγκρατεῦσθαι (Ecclus. xix. 6) is foreign to the older Greek, although this precise phrase : οὐκ ἐγκρατ., is sanctioned by Thomas, p. 30, and Phryn. p. 442. See Lobeck, *ad Phryn.* *l.c.* — γαμησάτ.] Regarding the later form of the aorist ἐγάμησα, see Lobeck, *ad Phryn.* p. 742. — πυροῦσθαι] *to be in a flame*, of vehement emotions (2 Cor. xi. 29 ; 2 Macc. iv. 38, x. 35, xiv. 45 ; of love, Anacreon, x. 13) ; it means here, “*occulta flamma concupiscentiae vastari*,” Augustine, *de sancta virginit.* 34. Comp. Suicer, *Thes.* II. p. 895 ; from the Rabbins, the history of Amram in Lightfoot, *Horae*, p. 190 ; from the classics, Jacobs, *Del. Epigr.* v. 34. — κρεῖσσον] not because it is the least

¹ Erasmus, Beza, Grotius, Calovius, Estius, *al.*, including Pott, Heydenreich, Billroth, Ewald.

² The prevalent and correct tradition of

the ancient church was that Paul was never married (Tertullian, Jerome, Chrysostom, *al.*). The contrary is stated in Clem. Alex. (in Eus. *H. E.* iii. 30).

of two evils (Rückert, Kling ; comp. Estius), but because to marry is no sin (vv. 28, 36), while to burn is sinful (Matt. v. 28).

Ver. 10. But to those *who have married* ; this is opposed to the *γαμησάτωσαν*, which referred to *future* marriages. Accordingly, just as *γαμησάτ.* applied only to *Christians* of both sexes leading a single life, so *γεγαμηκόσι*, too, refers exclusively to married persons both of whom were *Christians*. It is perfectly correct, therefore, to designate the married persons, where one party in the union was not a Christian, by *τοῖς λοιποῖς*, ver. 12 ; for, apart from the cases discussed down to ver. 12, there are no others remaining to be spoken of except those living in mixed marriage. Rückert understands *τοῖς γεγαμηκόσι* to mean specially the *newly married people* ; Paul, he holds, has a particular case in view, in which a single man perhaps had married a widow, which had been disapproved of by some ; and, because the apostle had given an opinion in ver. 8 unfavourable to such marriages, he must now forbid the dissolution of a union of that sort when once formed. But the fact of the *ἀγάμοι* and the widows being coupled together in ver. 8 lends no support whatever to this, for *ἀγάμοις* applies to *both* sexes. Moreover, were the *perfect* participle, which is the present of the completed action, meant here to convey the notion of “newly married,” this would need to be indicated either by some addition (such as *νεωστῇ*), or undoubtedly at least by the context. The fact, again, that Paul speaks first and chiefly of the wife (which Rückert explains on the ground of *the wife* having desired a separation), may very reasonably be accounted for, without supposing any special design, in this way, that the cases in which a *wife* separated herself from her husband presented to the Christian consciousness the *most anomalous* phenomenon in this sphere, and notwithstanding might not unfrequently occur in the wanton city of Corinth even within the Christian society.¹ This is quite sufficient, without there being any need for assuming that the apostle had been *questioned* about some case of this kind (Hofmann), particularly as the passage itself gives no sign of any such interrogation, but simply disposes of the point in the evenly course of the discussion regarding marriage, and with a view to its completeness. — *οὐκ ἐγὼ, ἀλλ’ ὁ Κύριος*] The negation is absolute. Paul knew from the living voice of tradition what commands Christ had given concerning divorce, Matt. v. 31 f., xix. 3–9 ; Mark x. 2–12 ; Luke xvi. 18. Hence *ὁ Κύριος*, *sc. παραγγέλλει*, for the authority of Christ lives on in His commands (against Baur, who infers from the present, which is to be supplied here, that Paul means the will of Christ made

¹ That we are to ascribe the tendency to such separation precisely to *devout enthusiasm* on the part of Corinthian wives leading them to shrink from matrimonial intercourse (de Wette, comp. Hofmann, p. 146), is a view which is inadmissible for this reason, that Paul, having before him such a mere error of feeling and judgment, would have made a disproportionate concession to it by saying *μενέτω ἄγαμος*. The

state of morals at Corinth is explanation enough, more especially in connection with the easy and frivolous way in which divorces took place in Greek social life generally (Hermann, *Privatalterth.* § xxx. 14–16), not merely by *dismissal* on the part of the husband (*ἀποπέμπειν*), but also by *desertion* on the part of the wife (*ἀπολείπειν*) ; comp. Bremi, *ad Dem.* I. p. 92.

known to him *by inspiration*). It is otherwise in 1 Thess. iv. 15. As regards the ἐγώ, again, Paul was conscious (ver. 40) that his individuality was under the influence of the Holy Spirit. He distinguishes, therefore, here and in vv. 12, 25, not between *his own* and *inspired* commands, but between those which *proceeded from his own* (God-inspired) *subjectivity* and those *which Christ Himself supplied by His objective word*. (R) Since, now, the πνεῦμα Θεοῦ in no way differs from the πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ (Rom. viii. 9–11), Κυρίου ἐντολαί (xiv. 37 according to the *Text. recept.*) could be predicated of the former class of precepts also, although neither in the same sense as of the latter, in which Paul's own subjectivity had no share whatever, nor with the same force of absolute obligation ; but, on the contrary, only in so far as the other party *recognizes* them as ἐντολὰς Κυρίου (xiv. 37). — μὴ χωρισθῆναι] *let her not be separated*, which, however, is not purely passive here (as in Polybius xxxii. 12. 7), but means : *let her not separate herself*. Isac. viii. 36, p. 73. For the rest, vv. 13, 15 prove that this phrase and μὴ ἀφιέναι in ver. 11 are not so different, that the former can be used *only* of the wife and the latter *only* of the husband.

Ver. 11. From ἐὰν to καταλλ. is a parenthesis pure and simple, disjoined from the rest of the sentence which continues with καὶ ἄνδρα. *But in case she should perhaps* (ἐὰν δέ) *even* (καί, i.e. *in fact, actually* ; see Hartung, *Partikell.* I. p. 132 f.) *be separated* (have separated herself) ; in this Paul is not granting something in the way of exception, as though the preceding injunction were not to be taken too strictly (which is set aside at once by οὐκ ἐγώ, ἀλλ' ὁ Κύρ., ver. 10), but he supposes a future case, which will possibly arise notwithstanding the commandment of the Lord's just adduced. The ἐὰν καί therefore, with the δέ of antithesis, introduces, as in ver. 28, an occurrence which will possibly be realized in the *experience of the future* (Hermann, *ad Viger.* p. 834 ; Winer, p. 275 [E. T. 367]). This in opposition to Rückert, who maintains that the words refer to that specific case (see on ver. 10), and mean : *if, however, she should perhaps have already separated herself* before receiving this decision ; and likewise to Hofmann, who renders : *if such a separation has actually already taken place* within the church, thereby presupposing that such a thing will henceforth never take place there again. — μενέτω ἄγαμος] assumes that her marriage is not to be looked upon as really dissolved ; hence she would be guilty of adultery should she contract another union. Comp. Matt. xix. 9. — ἢ] *or else* ; comp. on ix. 15. — καταλλαγήτω] *passive*, leaving it undefined as to who was the active subject in the case (see Buttmann, I. p. 368 ; Winer, p. 245 [E. T. 328]) : *let her be reconciled*, be friendly again with her husband. The voluntary separation of the wife from her husband is, in fact, just the cancelling of her peaceful relation to him, which is to be restored again. — καὶ ἄνδρα γυν. μὴ ἀφιέναι] *and that a husband put not away a wife*, send her from him, separate himself from her. Comp. Herod. v. 29 : ἀπέντα ταύτην τὴν γυναῖκα. This clause added by Christ (in accordance with Schamai's doctrine) : παρεκτὸς λόγου πορνείας, Matt. v. 32, xix. 9, does not occur in Luke xvi. 18 or Mark x. 11. We are not warranted in supposing that Paul was not aware of this exception having been recognized by Christ, or that he had perhaps never

heard of it at all, for the simple reason, that the validity of *this* ground of divorce was self-evident. Comp. on Matt. v. 32.

Ver. 12. The λοιποί are those who, before their conversion, had entered into marriage with a non-believer, so that one of the two had become a Christian and the other not. See on ver. 10. — οὐχ ὁ Κύριος.] For, as respected *such* marriages, *Christ* had given no command. He had no occasion to do so. Observe how suitably Paul refrains here from again using παραγγέλλω. — συνενδοκεῖ] *approves with him* (comp. on Rom. i. 32), joins in approving; for Paul takes for granted that the *Christian* partner on his side approves the continuance of the union.¹ It is alien to the scope of the passage to hold, with Billroth, that in συνενδ. is implied the contempt of the heathen for the Christians. Regarding οἰκεῖν μετά, *to dwell with*, of living together *in marriage*, see Scidler, *ad Eur. El.* 99 : ἐν γάμοις ζευχθεῖσαν οἰκεῖν, comp. 212.—It may be noted, moreover, that ver. 12 f. does not give permission to a Christian to marry a non-believer. “Non enim dixit : si quis ducit, sed : si quis habet infidelem;” Pelagius. περὶ τῶν πρὸ κηρύγματος συναφθέντων ἔφη, Theodoret.

Ver. 13. Καὶ οὗτος] a common turn of expression (instead of ὅς κ.τ.λ.) in connection with καί. See on Luke x. 8 and Kühner II. p. 526. — μὴ ἀφίετω τ. ἄνδρα] *let her not put away her husband*, not send him from her. To translate otherwise (let her not *leave* him) is, in view of ver. 12, altogether arbitrary. The Vulgate renders correctly : “non dimittat virum.” The apparent unsuitableness of the expression is happily explained by Bengel (on ver. 10) : “*Separatur pars ignobilior, mulier ; dimittit nobilior, vir ; inde conversa ratione etiam mulier fidelis dicitur dimittere, et vir infidelis separari, vv. 13, 15.*” In the *mixed* marriage Paul regards the *Christian* partner, even when it is the wife, as the one who, for the sake of Christianity, would have to *send away* the non-believer, were this in accordance with Christian principles. But these do not permit of it, and so the Christian wife is not to *send away* the non-believing husband, if he is willing to dwell with her; that would be on her part a *presumptuous* violation of duty. Comp. Harless, *Ehescheidungsfr.* p. 85. This view of the apostle’s has no connection with the right conceded even to wives among the Greeks and Romans of divorcing themselves from their husbands (loose principles on this subject were held also among the Rabbins; see Lightfoot, *Hor.* p. 191). But certainly Paul did not regard the Christian partner in a mixed marriage as the one who *was to rule* in general (in opposition to Olshausen); the head in every marriage, if it was to continue at all, was, in his view, according to Gen. iii. 16, the *husband*. 1 Cor. xi. 3, xiv. 34; Eph. v. 22; Col. iii. 18; 1 Tim. ii. 11 f.

Ver. 14.² For—this justifies the injunction given in vv. 12, 13—the *unholiness of the non-believing partner is taken away in virtue of his personal connec-*

¹ Hence the compound συνενδοκεῖ is used rightly and of deliberate purpose in the second part of the statement also, although there the husband is the subject, and it ought not to be supplanted by the simple

ἐνδοκεῖ, according to B (in opposition to Buttmann in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1860, p. 369).

² Comp. on this verse, Otto against *Abrenunciation*, 1864.

tion with the believer ; he is sanctified—this sanctification having its *causal basis* in the person of the Christian consort with whom he stands in married union, and the possible stumbling-block of self-profanation through continuing in such a marriage being thereby removed. Paul's judgment, therefore, is that the Christian ἀγιότης, the higher analogue of the Jewish theocratic consecration to God, affects even the non-believing partner in a marriage, and so passes over to him that he does not remain a profane person, but through the intimate union of wedded life becomes partaker (as if by a *sacred contagion*) of the higher divinely consecrated character of his consort, who belongs to the Israel of God, the holy φύραμα (Gal. vi. 16 ; Rom. xi. 16).¹ The clause : ἐπεὶ ἄρα τὰ τέκνα κ.τ.λ., shows that what the ἀπιστος is here said to have entered upon is not the moral holiness of the *new birth* (the subjective condition of which is nothing else but faith), but the holy consecration of that *bond of Christian fellowship* which forms the ἐκκλησία Θεοῦ, of which holiness, as arising out of this fellowship, the non-believing husband, in virtue of the inner union of life in which he stands to his Christian consort, has become a partaker (not, of course, without receiving a blessing morally also). The non-believer is, as it were, affiliated to the holy order of Christians by his union of married life with a Christian person, and, so soon as his spouse is converted to Christ and has thereby become holy, he too on his part participates in his own person (not “ simply in his *married* relationship,” to which Hofmann, following older interpreters, unwarrantably restricts the meaning of the text) in his consort's holiness, the benefit of which he receives in virtue of his fellowship of life with her, so that he is no longer ἀκάθαρτος as hitherto, but—although *mediately* after the fashion described—a ἡγιασμένος. The manifold misinterpretations of the older commentators may be seen in Poole's *Synopsis* and Wolf's *Curae*.² Observe, moreover, in how totally different a way Paul regarded the relation of the Christian who had connected himself with a *harlot* (vi. 15). In that case the harlot is the preponderating element, and the members of Christ become unholy, members of an harlot. — With ἐν τῇ γυν. and ἐν τῷ ἀνδ., comp. ἐν σοὶ πᾶς ἔγωγε σῶζομαι, Soph. *Aj.* 519 ; ἐν σοὶ ἐσμεν, Oed. R. 314, and the like ; Ellendt, *Lex. Soph.* I. p. 597. — ἐπεὶ ἄρα κ.τ.λ.] *because according to that* (if, namely, that ἡγιάσται did not hold good ; comp. v. 10), i.e. *because otherwise your children are unclean, profane*. That Christians' children are *not* profane, outside of the theocratic community and the divine covenant, and belonging to the unholy κόσμος, but, on the contrary, *holy*, is the *conceded* point from which Paul proves that the non-believing husband is sanctified through his believing wife ; for just as in

¹ In a mixed marriage, therefore, the Christian ἀγιότης forms, in relation to the non-Christian unholiness, the *preponderating* element, extending the character of sanctity even to what of itself would be profane ; as Chrysostom expresses it : νικᾷ ἡ καθαρότης τῆς γυναικὸς τὴν ἀκαθαρσίαν. Comp. the paraphrase of Erasmus : “ Non inficit deterioris impietas alterius pietatem, quin illud

potius praeponderat quod melius est et efficacius.”

² e.g. Calovius and others hold that ἡγ. refers to the *usus conjugal*is as sanctified *per preces* fidelis conjugis ; Tertullian, Jerome, Theodoret, Castalio, Estius, *al.*, think that it points to his being destined to be converted afterwards, so that the meaning would be *candidatus fidei* est.

the children's case, that which makes them holy is simply the specific bond of union with Christians (their parents) ; so, too, in the case of the mixed marriage, the same bond of union must have the same influence.¹— Had the *baptism* of Christian children been then in existence, Paul could not have drawn this inference, because in that case the *ἀγιότης* of such children would have had *another* basis.² That the passage before us does not even contain an exegetical *justification* of infant baptism, is shown in the remarks on Acts xvi. 15 (against de Wette in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1830, p. 669 ff., Neander, Olshausen, Osiander, and older expositors). Neither is it the point of departure, from which, almost of necessity, paedobaptism must have developed itself (Weiss, *bibl. Theol.* p. 423) ; such a point is rather to be found in the gradual development of the doctrine of original sin (s) — *ὑμῶν*] should not be restricted, as is done by most expositors, following Chrysostom (so recently, Pott, Flatt, Ewald, Harless), to *those involved in mixed marriages* ;³ but, as Paul himself makes clear by changing the person, referred to *the readers as Christian in general*⁴ (de Wette, Schrader, Rückert, Olshausen, Osiander, Neander, Maier, Hofmann ; Billroth is undecided), not, however, to the exclusion of the children of a mixed marriage, since it must be logically inferred that these, too, could not fail to have from their Christian father or mother at least “*quandam sanctitatis adsperginem*” (Anselm). In how far the offspring of mixed marriages were counted holy by the Jews, may be seen in Wetstein and Schoettgen *in loc.* — *νῦν δέ*] *but so*, as in ver. 11.

Ver. 15. Paul had before enjoined that the *Christian* partner should not make a separation if the non-Christian consents to remain. But what, if

¹ The essence of this bond of union, as regards the children, does not lie in their being *born* or *begotten* of Christian parents ; for the children, although holy for their parents' sakes, might be born or begotten before the father or mother had embraced Christianity. Nor are we warranted in saying, with Hofmann, that the child, as *the gift of God*, is holy, *for its relation to its parents*, who, so far as that is concerned, do not regard *the sin with which it is born*. That is arbitrarily to limit the apostle's thought, and to read all the most essential points of it from between the lines. On the contrary, the relationship which Paul here enunciates simply and without any artificial saving clause is one which consists in the *immediate close fellowship of life*, by virtue of which the consecration of Christian holiness attaching to the parents passes over from them to their children also, to whom otherwise, as being still *ἀπίστοις*, the predicate *ἀκάθαρτα* would rightly belong. Equally close and cordial is the fellowship of life between husband and wife, while every other kind of mutual connection is less intimate, and forms a more distant degree of

vital union. It is upon this *paritas rationis* that the validity of the argument depends.

² Comp. *Jebamoth*, f. lxxviii. 1 : “ Si gravis fit proselyta, non opus est, ut baptizetur infans quando natus fuerit ; baptismus enim matris ei cedit pro baptismo.”

³ *Ἀκάθαρτοι* is taken by many as equivalent to *spurii*. See Melancthon in particular : “ Si non placeret consuetudo conjugalis, filii vestri essent spurii et eatenus immundi, ἀκάθαρτοι. At filii vestri non sunt spurii ; ergo consuetudo conjugalis Deo placet.” He interprets *ἀκάθαρτοι* after *מְקַדְּשִׁים* in Deut. xxiii.

⁴ Comp. Müller, *v. d. Sünde*, II. p. 383, ed. 5. Our passage, however, ought not to be adduced to prove the universal pollution of men by nature and birth, for *ἀκάθαρτα* must denote, not moral, but theocratic uncleanness, like the *κοινά* of Acts x. 28. This against Ernesti also, *Ursprung der Sünde*, II. p. 162 ff. The children of Christians are, it is plain according to this verse, holy already (without baptism) at a time of life at which it is as yet inconceivable that the uncleanness should be removed through *fellowship* with the Redeemer *by faith*.

the *non-Christian* partner seeks separation? In that case they were to let such an one go without detention (*χωρίζεσθω*, permissive, see Winer, p. 291 [E. T. 390]); “suas sibi res habeat; frater sororve sit aequo animo,” Bengel. And the *reason* for this was: “*A believer in such circumstances is not enslaved, nay, surely* (*δέ* after the negative clause) *it is in peace that God has called us,*” so that this our calling forbids such a living together as would be *unpeaceful* through constraint. — *οὐ δεδούλ.*] *is not enslaved*, so, namely, as still to remain bound in marriage to such a *χωριζόμενος*.¹ The expression brings out the *unworthy* character of such a relationship. Comp. Gal. iv. 3; Plato, *Pol.* ix. p. 589 E; Soph. *Trach.* 256; 4 Macc. iii. 3 f., xiii. 2. See, on the other hand, the simple *δέδεται* in ver. 39. — *ἐν τοῖς τοιούτοις*] not, as Hofmann takes it: “*In matters of the natural life,*” to which marriage belongs, but in accordance with the context: *under such circumstances, i.e.* in such a position of things, where the non-believing consort separates himself. Luther renders well: “*in solchen Fällen.*” Comp. *ἐν τοῖσδε*, Soph. *Oed. Tyr.* 892. *ἐν τούτοις*, Plut. *Glor. Ath.* p. 350 A; Phil. iv. 11; *ἐν οἷς*, Antiph. i. 6, and Maetzner *in loc.*, p. 131. Only a comma should be placed after *τοιούτοις*. — *ἐν εἰρήνῃ*] is not the same as *εἰς εἰρήνην* (Rosenmüller, Flatt, Rückert, following older expositors; comp. also Billroth), or *ἵνα ὦμεν ἐν εἰρ.* (de Wette, Osiander, Gratama, Maier); for that which is stated is not *to what* God has called us (see, on the other hand, ver. 22; 1 Pet. v. 10), but *in what ethical form* God’s call has taken place. He has *so* called us, namely, to the Messiah’s kingdom, that He therewith caused *peace* to be proclaimed to us in respect of our relation to others (Eph. ii. 14 ff.). Analogous to this is the *ἐν* in Eph. iv. 4; 1 Thess. iv. 7; comp. also on Gal. i. 6. To understand, however, the *εἰρήνῃ* as referring to the peace of the soul *with God* (Harless, Hofmann) would be possible only if *δεδούλ.* were to be referred to binding of the *conscience*. And even in that case we should expect as correlative rather *ἐν* or *ἐπ’ ἐλευθερίᾳ* (Gal. v. 13).

REMARK.—Since *desertion* (*χωρίζεται*) appears here as an admissible ground for divorce, this has been thought to conflict with Matt. v. 32, xix. 9, and various explanations have been attempted (see Wolf *in loc.*). But the seeming contradiction vanishes, if we consider ver. 12, according to which Jesus had given no judgment upon *mixed* marriages; Matt. v. 32, therefore, can only bind the believing consort, in so far that he may not be *the one who leaves*. If, however, he is left by the non-believing partner, then, as this case does not fall under the utterance of Christ, the marriage may be looked upon as practically dissolved, and the believing partner is not bound. But to apply, as is often done, the permissive *χωρίζεσθω*, also to such marriages as are *Christian* on both sides — the *χωριζόμενος*, that is to say, being an unchristianly-minded Christian (Harless) — is exegetically inadmissible, seeing that the *λοιποί* who are here spoken of (see ver. 12) constitute the specific category of *mixed* marriages, in

¹ Weiss, in the *Deutsch. Zeitschr.* 1866, p. 267 (comp. his *bibl. Theol.* p. 423), understands *δεδούλ.* of the *burden of the conscience* in view of Christ’s command respecting the indissolubleness of marriage. Precisely so

Hofmann. But had Paul meant this, he must have indicated it more particularly. According to the context, *οὐ δεδούλ.* is the opposite of the *μὴ ἀφιέτω* in vv. 12, 13, denoting *legal necessity*, like *δέδεται* in ver. 39.

which, therefore, the one partner in each case falls to be reckoned among τοὺς ἔξω. So also pref. to 4th ed. p. vii. f. — Our text gives no express information upon the point, whether Paul would allow the Christian partner in such a union to *marry again*. For what οὐ δεδούλωται negatives is not the constraint “*ut caelebs maneat*” (Grotius, *al.*), but the necessity for the marriage being continued.¹ It may be *inferred*, however, that as in Paul's view mixed marriages did not come under Christ's prohibition of *divorce*, so neither would he have applied the prohibition of *remarriage* in Matt. v. 32 to the case of such unions. Olshausen is wrong in holding a second marriage in such cases unlawful, on the ground of its being, according to Matthew, *l.c.*, a μοιχεία. Christ Himself took no account of mixed marriages. Nor would ver. 11, which does not refer to marriages of that kind, be at variance with the remarriage of the believing partner (in opposition to Weiss, *bibl. Theol. l.c.*). (T)

Ver. 16. Confirmation of the foregoing thought, that the Christian *is not bound* in such cases, but, on the contrary, ought, in accordance with his vocation, to live in peace; *for neither does the (Christian) wife know whether she, by continuing to live with her (non-believing) husband, shall be the means of his conversion, nor does the (Christian) husband know*, etc. This uncertainty cannot be the basis of any constraint to the hurt of their peace.² Most expositors, on the other hand, from Chrysostom downwards, take εἰ in the sense of εἰ μή (see also Tholuck, *Bergpredig.* p. 251 f.), and hold that ver. 16 enunciates a new reason for *not* breaking up the marriage, namely, the possibility of the conversion of the non-believing husband. Ἀνάδεξαί φησιν ἐπὶ χρῆσταῖς ἐλπίσι τὸν πόνον. ἔχεις τὸν Θεὸν τῆς προθυμίας ἐπίκουρον, Theodoret. That is to say, they find in ἐν δὲ εἰρήνῃ κ.τ.λ. the thought: yet the Christian partner should do everything to maintain peace and bear with the heathen consort,—and either link to *this* the new reason given in ver. 16 (Flatt, Rückert, Olshausen, following Calvin and others), or else regard ver. 15 as a *parenthesis* (Grotius, *al.*). But the parenthetic setting aside of ver. 15 is as arbitrary as the turn given to the idea of ἐν δὲ εἰρήνῃ κ.τ.λ. is the contrary to context. With respect again to taking εἰ as equivalent to εἰ μή, it is perfectly true that εἰ, following upon the notion of uncertainty, may answer in meaning to εἰ μή (Thuc. ii. 53. 2; Krüger, § lxxv. 1. 8; Esth. iv. 14; 2 Sam. xii. 22; Joel ii. 14; Jonah iii. 9); but the thought which would thus emerge does not suit the connection here, because in it the point is the οὐ δεδούλωται, to which the proposed rendering of the εἰ would run counter.³ Moreover, this use of εἰ is foreign to the N. T., often though it occurs in the classics (see especially Kühner, *ad Xen. Mem.* i. 1. 8, *Anab.* iii. 2. 22). — τί] precisely as the German: “*was* weisst du, ob,” etc., so that in sense it is the same as: *how, in how far* (Ellendt, *Lex. Soph.* II. p. 823); it is not

¹ Photius, as cited by Oecumenius, says very justly: οὐκ ἔχει ἀνάγκην ὁ πιστὸς ἢ ἡ πίστις ἐν τοῖς ἀπίστοις τοιαύτην, οἷα αὐτῷ ἐπικείται ἐπὶ τῶν πιστῶν· ἐκεῖ μὲν γὰρ παντὶ τρόπῳ, χωρὶς λόγου πορνείας οὐκ ἔξεστιν ἀπ' ἀλλήλων τοὺς συναφθέντας χωρισθῆναι· ἐνταῦθα δὲ, ἂν μὲν συνευδοκῇ τὸ ἄπιστον μέρος τῷ πιστῷ συνοικεῖν, δεῖ μὴ λύειν τὸ συνοικέσιον· ἂν δὲ στασιάζῃ

καὶ τὴν λύσιν ἐκεῖνος ποιῇ, οὐ δεδούλωται ὁ πιστὸς εἰς τὸ μὴ χωρισθῆναι.

² Comp. de Wette, Osiander, Neander, Ewald, Maier, Hofmann [Stanley, Alford, Beet].

³ A *limitation* of the οὐ δεδούλωται, and that, too, of a quite general sort, comes in only with the εἰ μή κ.τ.λ. in ver. 17.

therefore the accusative of the object. Comp. $\tau\acute{\iota}$ οἶσι, $\tau\acute{\iota}$ δοκεῖς, Xen. *Hier.* i. 15. Regarding the *future* σώσεις comp. Stallbaum, *ad Gorg.* p. 249 ; Klotz, *ad Devar.* p. 508.

Ver. 17. $\epsilon\acute{\iota}$ μή] is meant, according to Grotius, to introduce an exception to the $\tau\acute{\iota}$ οἶδας : “*Illud quidem, quod dixi, non scis, sed hoc debes scire ;*” or, more exactly, since $\epsilon\acute{\iota}$ μή is not the same as ἀλλά (see on Gal. i. 7) : *Nothing but the duty dost thou know*, etc. Comp. my 3d edition. But this mode of joining on the verse is very harsh and forced in itself, and is, besides, unsuitable for this reason, that ver. 16 was only a subordinate thought, to which $\epsilon\acute{\iota}$ μή κ.τ.λ. as a newly introduced leading idea stands in no logical nexus. The logical connection of $\epsilon\acute{\iota}$ μή, *nisi*, etc., is, on the contrary, to be sought in the leading thought of the foregoing passage, which was οὐ δεδούλωται κ.τ.λ. This οὐ δεδούλωται . . . Θεός was enunciated without any limitation being put upon it hitherto. It was further confirmed in ver. 16. Paul desires now, in order to avert all frivolous and reckless procedure, to add to it the necessary limitation in the shape of a general principle of a practical kind, which should never be forgotten in connection with it.¹ We may paraphrase accordingly somewhat in this fashion : “*The believer is not in bondage in this matter, having, on the contrary, been called in peace, and not so much as knowing whether he shall save his non-believing consort ; he is not in bondage, only*² *he is not to use this freedom in a light and regardless way, but to remember that it is limited by the rule that every one ought to abide in a conservative spirit by the position in which God has placed and called him, and to conduct himself accordingly, instead of possibly seeking to break it up without any very pressing cause.*” Comp. as in substance agreeing with this, Olshausen, de Wette, Osiander, Ewald, Maier. Pott holds that χωρίζεται should be supplied after $\epsilon\acute{\iota}$ μή ; but the antithesis would require $\epsilon\acute{\iota}$ δὲ μή, and the rule which follows would be very superfluous in a case where no separation had taken place, more especially after ver. 12 f. Vater and Rückert supply σώσεις : “*But even if thou shouldst not, the general rule applies in every case.*” Were that correct, we should of necessity find $\epsilon\acute{\iota}$ δὲ καὶ μή. Lastly, there is the view of those who would join $\epsilon\acute{\iota}$ μή to the preceding clause (τινές in Theophylact, Knatchbull, Homberg, Hammond, Olearius, Morus, and recently Hofmann) : *if thou shalt save thy wife, if (or) not ?*³ Now this is not, indeed, excluded by the μή (as Rückert thinks, who requires οὐ ; but see Hartung, *Partikell.* II. p. 123) ; still the addition would be quite inappropriate to the sense of the two questions, for these convey the idea : *thou knowest not at all if*, etc., with which the alternative *necne* does not harmonize,—on which ground, too, Hofmann makes ver. 16 to be the concluding

¹ Paul had doubtless ground enough in the rich experience of his career for giving this warning. How often in the cases of conversion to Christianity must the deep inward change have had linked to it a yearning after some change of outward relationships!—an offence against the practical rule : “*Qua positus fueris, in statione mane*” (Ovid, *Fasti*, ii. 674), which Paul

here gives expression to in a *Christian* form.

² Respecting $\epsilon\acute{\iota}$ μή in the sense of πλήν, see Poppo, *ad Thuc.* III. 1, p. 216 ; and respecting the principal sentence annexed to it, Buttmann, *neut. Gram.* p. 308 [E. T. 359].

³ Hence the reading ἢ μή in more recent codd. Severianus in Oecumenius, Chrysostom, ms. Syr. p. on the margin.

confirmation of the whole admonition beginning with τοῖς δὲ λοιποῖς in ver. 12. This, again, is impossible, for this reason, that the *first* part of the counsel given to the λοιποί has already received its confirmation in the γάρ of ver. 14, and in accordance therewith the γάρ of ver. 16 must now refer in the way of confirmation only to the *second* part of the said counsel, as contained in ver. 15. Hofmann's interpretation is in the most complicated opposition to the plan and development of the apostle's argument. Rinck, in his *Lucubr. crit.* p. 142 f. (and so previously Theodoret), connects from εἰ μὴ on to Κύριος with the preceding passage : "nescis enim, an salvum eum facturum sis, nisi prout quemque Dominus adjuverit." But ἐκάστῳ ὡς ἐμέρ. ὁ Κ. and ἕκαστον ὡς κέκλ. ὁ Θ. are manifestly parallel, and, as such, contain not a frigid repetition (Rinck), but an earnest exhaustion of the thought. — ἐκάστῳ ὡς] the same as ὡς ἐκ., but with emphasis on the ἐκάστῳ. Comp. iii. 5, x. 16 ; Rom. xii. 3. *As the Lord (God) hath apportioned to each* (has bestowed his outward lot), *as* (i.e. ἣ κλήσει, ver. 20) *God hath called each* (to the Messiah's kingdom), *so let him walk*, i.e. according to the standard of this outward position (without seeking, therefore, to break with it or step out from it, vv. 20, 24) let him regulate his conduct, his course of life. Ἐμέρισεν, *has given his portion* (Polybius, xxxi. 18. 3, xi. 28. 9 ; Eccles. xlv. 20 ; 2 Macc. viii. 28 ; 4 Macc. xiii. 18), refers to the earthly relations of life, according to which, e.g., a man may be married to this person or that (and it is to *this* relationship that the primary application is to be made), may be circumcised or uncircumcised, a slave or free,¹ etc. See ver. 18 ff. These relationships of life are here regarded as a whole, out of which each individual has received his μέρος from God (τὸ μεμερισμένον, Lucian, *D. D.* xxiv. 1), in accordance with the varying *modes* (ὡς) of the divine apportionment. Comp. the classical ἡ εἰμαρμένη, *sors attributa*. We have to supply neither περιπατεῖν (Hofmann), nor anything else. *What* the Lord has apportioned is just the μέρος, which each man has. Reiche, *Comm. crit.* I. p. 175 ff., understands μερίζειν in the theocratic-Messianic sense, and makes ὁ Κύριος refer to *Christ* : "in qua vitae externae sorte ac statu (ὡς, conf. ver. 18) cuique Dominus beneficiorum suorum quasi partem tribuit." According to this, what would be meant would be the μερίς τοῦ κλήρου τῶν ἀγίων (Col. i. 12), which, however, refers to the bliss of the *future αἰών*, and would require, therefore, to be understood here *proleptically*. But there are two considerations which put a decided negative upon this view : first, the reference assumed for the absolute ἐμέρ. is not suggested by the context (see, on the contrary, ver. 18 ff.) ; and in the second place, logically the calling must *go first*, since *before* it there can be no mention of the Messianic μερίζειν (Rom. viii. 30, x. 14 ; Col. i. 12). This holds also against the essentially similar interpretation of Harless, which *co-ordinates* ἐμέρ. with the calling. —

¹ The *call* of the individuals to salvation took place in these differently apportioned positions and relationships in life. Hence the ὡς ἐμέρισεν takes precedence of the ὡς κέκληκεν. Hofmann is wrong in holding that the ὡς ἐμέρισεν might lie on this side or on that of the calling, and might consist even

in a change of the situation in which they had been when called. This mistake should have been precluded even by what follows, which always starts from those circumstances alone which subsisted *at the time of the calling* ; see vv. 18, 21, 24.

κέκληκεν] a completed transaction continuing to the present in its results, hence the *perfect*; the *aurist* ἐμέρ., on the other hand, indicated something merely which *took place* as an act of the *past*, and this act occurred *before* the κέκληκεν, at birth, or some other point in life. — καὶ οὕτως κ.τ.λ.] showing the importance of this rule, which Paul is not by any means laying down simply with a view to the special state of things at *Corinth*, but, etc., *να τῷ ἔχειν καὶ ἄλλους κοινωνοὺς προθυμότεροι περὶ τὴν ὑπακοὴν διατεθῶσι*, Theophylact. — διατάσσ.] *I ordain, appoint*, xi. 34, xvi. 1. Observe the evidence here of apostolic power over the church.

Ver. 18 ff. Further explanation of this injunction by way of example, and not bearing simply on the case of Christians living in mixed marriage.¹ — The *protases* do not convey a *question* either here or in ver. 27, being in the rhetorically emphatic form of the hypothetical indicative. See Bernhardt, p. 385. Comp. Kühner, II. p. 561. — μὴ ἐπισπάσθω] *ne sibi attrahat*, sc. *praeputium*. A surgical operation frequent among the later Jews (1 Macc. i. 15, and Grimm *in loc.*; Josephus, *Antt.* xii. 5. 1), described in detail by Celsus, vii. 25. 5, or otherwise performed, by which a sort of foreskin was again drawn over the *glans*—resorted to not only in cases of perversion to heathenism, but also from shame or fear of heathen eyes, before which men sought to avoid appearing (in baths, for example, or otherwise) as *circumcised*. With Christians this might especially be occasioned by a shrinking from the eyes of *Gentile converts*. See, besides Wetstein, Groddeck in Schoettgen's *Horae*, p. 1159 f.; Lightfoot, p. 194; Lübker in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1835, p. 657. Such persons were styled מְשִׁיבִים. See Buxtorf, *Lex. Talm.* p. 1274. — ἐν ἀκροβ.] Comp. Rom. iv. 10.

Ver. 19. Comp. Rom. ii. 25 ff.; Gal. v. 6. From the Christian point of view *it matters nothing* whether a man be circumcised or not; comp. viii. 8. — ἀλλὰ τήρησις ἐντολ. Θεοῦ] *but keeping of the commands of God*, sc. τὰ πάντα ἐστι, as in iii. 7. According to the Christian idea (Rom. xiii. 8), there is no difference between this and the faith that worketh by love (Gal. v. 6). Billroth is wrong in taking it as: “*In themselves* circumcision and uncircumcision are alike indifferent; such things are of importance only *in so far as* they are an observing of the commandments of God;” for ἡ ἀκροβ. cannot be included with the other under τήρ. ἐντ. Θεοῦ.

Ver. 20. An emphatic repetition of the *rule* after giving the *illustration* of it. Comp. ver. 24. — ἐν τῇ κλήσει ἢ ἐκλήθῃ] Since Calvin, expositors have often understood κλήσις of the *outward position in life*, like our *calling* [*Beruf*], and have supplied ἐν before ἢ in accordance with the pure Attic idiom (Stallbaum, *ad Plat. Phaed.* p. 76 D; Kühner, *ad Xen. Mem.* ii. 1. 32). So, recently, Rückert. But although κλήσις (Dionys. Hal. *Antt.* iv. 18) does expressly correspond to the Latin *classis*, a *division of the burghesses*, according to the true derivation of that technical term from the Greek, yet even profane writers never use κλήσις in the sense of *avocation* [*Beruf*] (rank, and the like); and in the whole N. T. the *Christian* meaning of καλεῖν and κλήσις is

¹ Theodoret says well: εἴτα συνήθως ἀπὸ τοῦ προκειμένου εἰς ἕτερα μεταβαίνει, πᾶσι νομοθετῶν τὰ κατάλληλα.

that in which they are invariably used, and so here also : *in the calling* (to the Messianic kingdom (*through which* (η being the *dat. instrum.*, as in 2 Tim. i. 9) *he was called*. This may have been, that is to say, a $\kappa\lambda\eta\sigma\iota\varsigma$ going forth from God to a circumcised man or an uncircumcised, to a slave or a free-man, etc. If, now, the man, for example, who was called in circumcision by a *vocatio circumcisi* thereafter restores the foreskin, so as to give himself out for an uncircumcised person, he does not abide in the calling through which he was called. The right interpretation is already given by Chrysostom and Theophylact ($\epsilon\nu\ \omicron\iota\omega\ \beta\iota\omega\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \epsilon\nu\ \omicron\iota\omega\ \tau\acute{\alpha}\gamma\mu\alpha\tau\iota\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \pi\omicron\lambda\iota\tau\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha\tau\iota\ \omega\nu\ \epsilon\pi\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\epsilon\nu\sigma\epsilon\nu,\ \epsilon\nu\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omega\ \mu\epsilon\nu\acute{\epsilon}\tau\omega\ \kappa\lambda\eta\sigma\iota\nu\ \gamma\grave{\alpha}\rho\ \tau\eta\nu\ \epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma\ \tau\eta\nu\ \pi\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\iota\nu\ \pi\rho\omicron\sigma\alpha\gamma\omega\gamma\acute{\eta}\nu\ \phi\eta\sigma\iota$). Comp. ver. 17 : $\omega\varsigma\ \kappa\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\lambda\eta\kappa\epsilon\nu\ \acute{\omicron}\ \Theta\epsilon\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$. The emphatic $\epsilon\nu\ \tau\alpha\upsilon\tau\eta$ (vi. 4) points at the misdirected yearning for *another* state of matters through which *another* $\kappa\lambda\eta\sigma\iota\varsigma$ would present itself, as *e.g.* through the $\epsilon\pi\iota\sigma\pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ a being called $\epsilon\nu\ \acute{\alpha}\kappa\rho\omicron\beta\upsilon\sigma\tau\acute{\iota}\alpha$, etc.

Ver. 21. $M\eta\ \sigma\omicron\iota\ \mu\epsilon\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\tau\omega$] *let it give thee no concern*, let it be all the same to thee. Hom. *Il.* ii. 338, x. 92 ; Plato, *Phaed.* p. 95 B ; *Tim.* p. 24 B ; *Wisd.* xii. 13 ; Mark iv. 38, *al.* What it is that ought to give him no concern, is plain from the immediate context, namely, *his being called as a slave* ; not, as Hofmann would read into the text, *his seeming to be doomed to life-long slavery*. — $\alpha\lambda\lambda'\ \epsilon\acute{\iota}\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \kappa.\tau.\lambda.$] *but, even if thou art in circumstances to become free, use it rather*, namely, the having been called as a slave ; make use rather (instead of becoming free) of thy “*vocatio servi*” by remaining true to thy position as a slave. Comp. ver. 20. So, in substance, Chrysostom, Theodoret, Theophylact. Camerarius, Estius, Wolf, Bengel, and many of the older interpreters ; among more modern expositors, de Wette, Oslander, Maier, Ewald,¹ Baur (in the *theol. Jahrb.* 1852, p. 26 ff.), also Vaihinger in Herzog's *Encykl.* XIV. p. 474 f. ; Weiss, *bibl. Theol.* p. 417 f. The $\alpha\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha}$ is nothing else than the German *sondern*, corresponding to the preceding $\mu\eta\ \sigma\omicron\iota\ \mu\epsilon\lambda.$, and $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\ \kappa\alpha\iota$ is *etsi* (Herm. *ad Viger.* p. 832 ; Stallbaum, *ad Plat. Apol.* p. 32 A ; Baeumlein, *Partik.* p. 151), so that it conveys the sense : *even although, if even* ; and in the conditional clause the emphasis is made by $\kappa\alpha\iota$ to fall upon $\delta\upsilon\nu\alpha\sigma\alpha\iota$. The Syriac, however (“*elige tibi potius quam ut servias*”), and most modern commentators, supply $\tau\eta\ \epsilon\lambda\epsilon\nu\theta\epsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\alpha$ after $\chi\rho\eta\sigma\alpha\iota$, with Luther, Erasmus, Castalio, Beza, Calvin, Grotius, Cornelius à Lapide, and many others (a view mentioned, too, by Chrysostom). *Paul's advice*, they hold, *is rather to avail oneself of the opportunity of becoming free*. But this is grammatically incorrect, because it goes in the face of the $\kappa\alpha\iota$,² and

¹ Who, however, expounds $\chi\rho\eta\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ as meaning *to let oneself be used*, i.e. *to be dependent* without being able to establish any precedent for such a rendering. Regarding $\chi\rho\eta\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ without a dative of the object, see Stallbaum, *ad Plat. Rep.* p. 452 C, 489 B.

² What devices have been practised of late with this $\kappa\alpha\iota$! Billroth thinks that it indicates an accessory thought : “this, too, is not to be denied, that if thou canst be free,” etc. Rückert thinks that it denotes a climax and properly (?) belongs to $\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\theta.$:

“but if thou mayest even be free,” etc. Olshausen holds that *spiritual* freedom is implied in $\kappa\alpha\lambda\epsilon\acute{\iota}\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$, and that, starting from this idea, Paul goes on : “but if in addition to thy spiritual freedom thou canst obtain also bodily liberty, avail thyself of it rather.” Even Neander substantially agrees with this. But upon Billroth's view $\kappa\alpha\iota$ would require to come before $\epsilon\acute{\iota}$; upon Rückert's and Olshausen's, before $\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\theta.$; and the turn given to the clause by the latter is but one proof out of many that

contrary also to the connection, for Paul would thus be contravening his own thrice-repeated injunction : *let each man remain*, etc. (v) The ground specially founded on (in a very unhermeneutical way) by Rückert, that the old interpretation is against the *spirit* of the apostle, is untenable ; for the advice to use the opportunities of obtaining freedom—an advice comparatively unimportant and paltry in view of the Parousia believed to be at hand—by no means corresponds with the apostle's lofty idea that all are one in Christ (Gal. iii. 28 ; 1 Cor. xii. 13 ; Col. iii. 11) ; that in Christ the slave is free and the freeman a slave (ver. 22) ; as, indeed, ver. 22 can furnish a confirmation of ver. 21 only on the ground of the old exposition, descending from Chrysostom, *al.*, of *μᾶλλον χρῆσαι*. It may be added, that that idea of true Christian equality carries in itself the germ of the *abolition* of slavery ; the latter is the ripe fruit of the former. The moral consciousness of Christendom has not in this respect *advanced beyond* the standpoint of Paul (Baur) ; it is but a further *development* of the same *principle* which he enunciates, the future influence of which, however, upon the removal of slavery the apostle himself was not led to consider more closely from his expectation of the nearness of that great change which was to bring in for *all* believers the glorious liberty of the children of God. He left slavery, therefore, unassailed, as he did civil relations in general, not even asking, in his letter to Philemon, that Onesimus should be set free, but introducing the idea of Christian love, unity, and equality (xii. 13 ; Gal. iii. 28 ; Eph. vi. 8 ; Philem. 16 ; Col. iv. 1),—an idea, the consequence of which is necessarily the cessation of slavery, although just as necessarily it was not natural for the apostle, with his eye turned to the approaching Parousia, to single out this consequence and apply it to an age of the world which, in his view, was on the point of passing away. It may be further noted that he does not *forbid* an exchange of slavery for freedom, which was in itself allowable ; but he *dissuades* from it as a trifling way of dealing with the position in question, under the circumstances of the time, when viewed from the height of the Christian standpoint.

Ver. 22. *For the converted slave is Christ's freedman ; in like manner, too* (ὁμοίως καὶ introduces the precise reversal of relations which here also takes place), *the freeman who becomes a Christian is the slave of Christ*. That moral freedom (comp. John viii. 36) and this moral slavery are of course essentially identical (Rom. vi. 16 ff. ; Eph. vi. 6 ; Col. iii. 24) ; but Paul grounds here his admonition in ver. 21 by showing that the matter may be looked at from a twofold *point of view* : the Christian slave should recognize *his* relation to Christ as that of an ἀπελεύθερος Χριστοῦ,¹ and the *freeman's* relation as that of a δοῦλος Χριστοῦ. This will serve in his case this end, not by any

men may make anything out of everything, if they—*will*. Hofmann considers that καὶ lays emphasis on the *reality* (comp. on ver. 11) as contrasted with the mere *wish*, which wish, however, is only brought in by an erroneous explanation of μή σοι μελέτω. He even maintains that, according to our understanding of the verse, Paul

must have written καὶ εἰ. He *might* have written either, and would, had it been καὶ εἰ, have meant *even in the case that* ; but he meant εἰ καὶ (*if thou art even in a position to*, etc.), and *therefore wrote it* and nothing else. The latter is as little absurd as the former.

¹ So that “εἰ σῶμα δοῦλον, ἀλλ’ ὁ νοῦς ἐλεύθερος,” Soph. *Fragm.* 677, Dindorf.

means (as Hofmann illogically inserts into the text, despite the μένειν again required in ver. 24) that he should count it unnecessary to remain in the position of a slave,¹ but, on the contrary, that he should abide contentedly in his station without coveting freedom. — ὁ ἐν Κυρίῳ κλ. δοῦλ.] *the slave who is called in the Lord, i.e. who has received the Christian calling.* That is to say, this κλησις has not taken place, as any other might, *out of* Christ, but *in* Him, as being the distinctive element in which it has its specific character. The ἐν Κυρίῳ, which might have been understood of itself, is expressly *added* here, because it was meant to be an emphatic correlate to the Κυρίου which follows. It is wholly foreign to the argument to imagine a contrast here with the *earthly* master (Hofmann), as in Eph. vi. 5 ; Col. iii. 22, iv. 1. — ἀπελεύθερος with the genitive is not used here in the common sense of *libertus alicujus*, some one's manumitted slave, for the master hitherto had been sin or Satan (see on vi. 20) ; but simply *a freed-man belonging to Christ* (comp. κλητοὶ Ἰησοῦ X., Rom. i. 6), after Christ, namely, has set him free *from the service of another* (comp. Ignatius, *ad Rom.* 4). This was self-evident to the consciousness of the reader.

Ver. 23. *For a price* (see on vi. 20) *were ye* (my readers in general) *bought* (namely, by Christ to be His slaves) ; *become not* (therefore) *servants of men* ; *i.e.* do not make yourselves dependent upon what men wish and demand of you, instead of allowing your conduct to be moulded by Christ's will and service. Paul designs that this should be applied to the mistaken submission shown on the part of the church to such as wished that men should break up or alter their civil relationships and other existing situations to please them, and in compliance with their solicitations and deceptive suggestions. This more specific reference of the warning, in itself conveyed in general terms, we may naturally gather from ver. 24. Instigations and seductions of this kind, arising partly, perhaps, from fanatical excitement, must plainly have occurred at Corinth in connection with circumstances of the details of which we are ignorant ; for otherwise the whole of the minute instructions from ver. 17 to ver. 24 would lack any concrete basis. The interpretation with which Chrysostom and Theophylact content themselves is therefore much too vague : that Paul is forbidding men-pleasing generally, and compliance with immoral demands. So also Theodore's view, that he enjoins μὴ δουλοπρεπὲς ἔχειν φρόνημα. Osiander and Neander's rendering is too general also. ("every kind of wrong dependence"). It is altogether alien to the context, vv. 17–24, to suppose that ἀνθρώπων refers to Paul, Cephas, Apollos, etc. (Rückert), and that the meaning is substantially the same as had been expressed in iii. 21 by μηδεὶς καυχάσθω ἐν ἀνθρώποις (Hofmann). Equally out of accordance with the subject in hand is Billroth's exposition (given before by Vatablus), that the apostle exhorts *the slaves* not to do their service *for the sake of men*, but for the Lord's sake (Col. iii. 22). Heydenreich, on the other hand, holds (with

¹ Paul is, in fact, guarding by this grand utterance of his against all unjust contempt for the condition of outward slavery,—a feeling which vanishes in the light of Chris-

tianity side by side with all unjust estimation of the worth of mere outward freedom.

Menochius, Hammond, Knatchbull, Mosheim, Michaelis, Zachariae) that he is admonishing *the freemen* not to sell themselves into slavery. But, even putting out of account the second person plural, which directs the words to the readers generally, were that the meaning, Paul would undoubtedly have called attention to a new illustration of his rule, as he does in vv. 18, 21. And how unlikely a thing that men went into slavery in those days *for the sake of Christianity* (for according to the connection it is *this* motive which must be presupposed, not : *for gain's sake*)!

Ver. 24. To conclude the whole digression, the weighty rule is once more enunciated (ἐν ᾧ κ.τ.λ. : In whatever relationship, in whatever outward position, etc.), and now with the strengthening clause παρὰ Θεῷ, which describes the ἐν τούτῳ μένειν according to its moral and religious character ; that outward abiding is to be of such a kind that therein the man shall abide inwardly *with God* (the caller), which moral relation of fellowship is *locally* represented in a concrete way by παρὰ ("a Deo non recedens," Estius). Comp. Theophylact,—who, however, makes out a special reference to immoral obedience to masters,—Schrader, Rückert, Neander, Osiander. De Wette limits the meaning to the relation of a Christian slave, as in ver. 22, which, after the general ver. 23, is inadmissible. The common interpretation, "*coram Deo*" (Calvin), "*Deo inspectante*" (Grotius), which would imply: "perpetuo memores, vos in ejus conspectu versari" (Beza, comp. de Wette), would correspond to the current phrase ἐνώπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ. Hofmann makes ἐν ᾧ and ἐν τούτῳ refer to *Christ* (comp. ver. 22) ; the call took place *in Christ to God*, and therefore every one is to have *in Christ* (on His mediatorial foundation) his abiding *with God*. The perfect conformity of ver. 24 with ver. 20 ought, had it stood alone, to have prevented this misinterpretation. But besides, the call is given *from God*, not *to God*, but to eternal Messianic life (comp. on i. 9).

Ver. 25. Δέ] indicating the transition to a new section in the discussion on marriage. — παρθένων] *virgins*. We are not to understand this¹ of the *unmarried of both sexes*, young men and maidens, which is contrary to the ordinary usage of the language (see too, vv. 34, 36, 37) ; for in such passages as Rev. xiv. 4, Oecumenius, *Quaest. Amphil.* 188 ; Nonnus on John xix. 26 ; Fabricius, *Pseudepigr. V. T.* II. pp. 92, 98 ; also Arist. *Eq.* 1302, the word is *maidenly* ; and that it ever with Greek writers means *a single man* in the proper sense, is at least very doubtful. — γνώμην] *view, opinion*. As regards γνώμ. δίδωμι (2 Cor. viii. 10), see the examples in Kypke, II. p. 205. — The sense most in accordance with the context for πιστός is that of *credible*, i.e. *trustworthy* (1 Tim. iv. 9). The more general *faithful* (in the service of Christ ; so Billroth, Rückert, Ewald) is less suitable ; and least of all the simple *believing*, as Hofmann would have it. Paul's being an ἀξιώχρεως σύμβουλος (Theodoret) he ascribes to the mercy of Christ : for he knows well in himself that that characteristic would not belong to him without Christ's gracious call to the apostleship, and without enlightenment and aid from Him. Comp. also ver. 40. Hence ὥς (*quippe*) ἐλεημένος κ.τ.λ.

¹ With Theodore of Mopsuestia, Bengel, Semler, Zachariae, Schleusner, Schulz, Rosenmüller, Flatt, Pott, Olshausen, Ewald.

Ver. 26. In *carrying out* his theme *de virginibus*, Paul proceeds as follows: first, in the passage extending to ver. 35 he gives a general recommendation of single life *to both sexes*, and only then deals with the subject of virgins exclusively on to ver. 38. — οὖν] *therefore*, introduces now the γνώμη in accordance with what was said in ver. 25. — ἀνθρώπῳ] refers, as the more detailed remarks in ver. 27 ff. prove, not to *virgins* alone (Hofmann), as applied to whom, besides, it would be an awkward expression,¹ but means: *a person*, including both sexes. It is otherwise in ver. 1.—οὕτως] *so, as he is*, i.e. *unmarried*, which follows from τ. παρθένων, ver. 25. To be so Paul esteems *salutary* (καλόν, as in ver. 1), not absolutely and in itself, but because the Parousia is near, and still nearer, therefore, must be the general calamities which are to precede it, the *dolores Messiae*, חבלי משיח (see on Matt. xxiv. 3). These form the *instant* (iii. 23) *distress*, i.e. a distress which is impending and has already begun to set in. Comp. Matt. xxiv. 19. The persecutions (Pott, Flatt, Hofmann, after older expositors) are only a part of it. Matrimonial cares and sufferings, again (Schulz, following Theophylact and others), are not meant at all. See ver. 39 ff. — As little are we to understand “impending *constraint* through marriage” (Cropp in the *Jahrb. f. Deutsche Theol.* 1866, p. 103), against which θλίψιν alone, in ver. 28 and ver. 31, testifies with sufficient clearness. Comp. rather τῇ ἐνεστώσῃ ἀνάγκῃ, 3 Macc. i. 16, the distress *having set in*, and see generally on Gal. i. 4. — The *construction* is anacoluthic, so that τοῦτο, which belongs to νομίζω, prepares for the following καλὸν ὑπάρχειν on to οὕτως εἶναι (comp. on Rom. ii. 3 and Kühner, § 631. 2); but then ὅτι καλὸν κ.τ.λ., which states the contents of the νομίζω, instead of ending simply with ἀνθρώπῳ τὸ οὕτως εἶναι, begins from the beginning again, and that with a ὅτι, which comes in in place of the construction with the infinitive (Kühner, § 771. 5). A manifest confusion of expression, into which in dictation Paul might be especially likely to fall by forgetting, after the enunciation of the principal thought διὰ τ. ἐνεστ. ἀνάγκ., that he had already said καλὸν ὑπάρχειν. Hence, too, it is more natural to connect διὰ τ. ἐνεστ. ἀνάγκ. with what precedes it than hyperbatically with ὅτι κ.τ.λ. (Ewald, Hofmann).² Translate: *My opinion, then, is this, that it is good on account of the impending distress,—that it is good [I think] for a person to be in such a position.* Heydenreich holds wrongly—as the fact of there being no αὐταῖς added is enough of itself to show—that ὅτι should be read, so that Paul would say that what is good *for the man* is good *for them*, namely, single life. De Wette takes τοῦτο as equivalent to παρθένον εἶναι, and then renders ὅτι by *because*: “because it is in general good for a man to be unmarried.”³ But this “*in general*” is not in the text, and yet of necessity it would have required to be there, for without it the argument emerges as an *idem per*

¹ ἀνθρωπος as a *feminine* usually answers in Greek writers, as is well known, to the German colloquial phrase “*das Mensch*.”

² Ewald, moreover, takes τὸ οὕτως εἶναι to mean “*that it should be so*,” referring to the following rule δέδεσται, κ.τ.λ.

³ This rendering occurs in substance in Erasmus, Castalio, Calvin. Beza, too, agrees with it in his explanation of τοῦτο, but understands ὅτι καλὸν κ.τ.λ. as *resumptive*.

idem ; and in truth, even were the “in general” expressed, the main statement would be an inappropriate one, since it would contain nothing to establish the essential element διὰ τ. ἐνεστ. ἀνάγκην. The *anacoluthon* of the passage belongs to those in which “celeritate quadam abrepti novam enuntiationem inchoamus priore nondum absoluta,” Bremi, *ad Lys.* Exc. V. p. 442.

Ver. 27. Lest the γνώμη in ver. 26 should be misinterpreted as favouring divorce, he now prefaces his further discussion of the subject with the rule, which is appropriate here only as a caveat: *let not the married desire to be loosed*. The construction is as in ver. 18. — γυναικί] *dativus communionis*, as in Rom. vii. 2, and with Greek writers. It is plain, especially from vv. 29 and 34, that δέδ. γυν. does not mean *betrothal* (Ewald and Hofmann), but that γυνή denotes a *married wife*. — λέλυσαι] does not imply: *art thou separated* from (Mosheim, Semler), but *art thou free* from, unentangled with a wife, *single* (“sive uxorem habueris, sive non,” Estius; comp. so early an interpreter as Photius)? See ver. 28, and comp. Xenophon, *Cyr.* i. 1. 4, where λελύσθαι ἀπ’ ἀλλήλων is equivalent to αὐτόνομα εἶναι.

Ver. 28. Οὐχ ἡμαρτες] But should it be the case that thou shalt have married, *thou hast not sinned* therein. Comp. Matthiae, p. 1203; Buttmann, *neut. Gr.* p. 172 [E. T. 199]. Hofmann is wrong here also (comp. on ver. 11) in holding that ἐὰν δὲ καί means: but if *already actually*, etc. — γήμη ἡ παρθ.] Here as in 1 Tim. v. 11 the term γαμεῖν is applied, indeed, to the woman (see on ver. 39), but without violation of rule, since it is not joined with an accusative. Comp. Fritzsche, *ad Marc.* p. 424. — τῇ σαρκί] not in the ethical sense, but (comp. Gal. iv. 13) for the material, animal part of man’s nature. In troublous times the married man is exposed to special anguish from sufferings of this kind (hunger, nakedness, sickness, misuse, banishment, etc.). Whether we have here a dative of appropriation (trouble for the flesh; see on 1 Cor. xii. 7; Bernhardt, p. 88), or whether it belongs to the verb, cannot well be determined. — ἐγὼ δὲ ὑμ. φείδομαι] *but I, for my part, deal tenderly towards you*, in advising you rather to remain unwedded; for by this advice, if you will follow it, I spare you such θλίψεις.

Vv. 29-31. *This, however, I say, i.e. of what follows I assure you.* Comp. xv. 50. Δέ leads over to something wherewith Paul (“as it were prophesying,” Ewald) *designs to secure the more acceptance* for the counsel, which he has given with the view of sparing his readers. Pott, Flatt, and others take τοῦτο δέ φημι κ.τ.λ. as a more precise explanation of θλίψιν . . . τοιοῦτοι, and then vv. 32-35 as a more precise explanation of ἐγὼ δὲ ὑμ. φείδ. Two things militate against this—first, the more emphatic import of φημί (comp. also x. 15, 19; Ellendt, *Lex. Soph.* II. p. 906), which is stronger than λέγω; and secondly, the correct view of συνεσταλμ. (see below). Rückert takes it: “Happen, however, what may, marry ye or not, *this* remark I cannot suppress.” But were that the meaning, τοῦτο δέ φ. would require to follow at once after οὐχ ἡμαρτε. — ὁ καιρός] *the space of time*,—subsisting up to the Parousia,—not *our earthly lifetime* in general (Calvin, Vorstius, Estius, *al.*); neither is it merely the time yet to elapse *ere that ἀνάγκη arrives* (Reiche),

which would be more distinctly indicated than by the simple ὁ καιρός ; besides, the ἀνάγκη has already begun to make itself felt, ἐνεστῶσα, ver. 26. — συννεσταλμένος] is taken by most recent expositors (Schulz, Rosenmüller, Stolz, Pott, Heydenreich, Flatt, Rückert, Olshausen, Neander ; Billroth is undecided) as meaning *calamitosum*. But without warrant of usage ; for in passages such as 1 Macc. iii. 6 (comp. Polyb. v. 15. 8, xxiv. 5. 13 ; Plato, *Lys.* p. 210 E ; Isocrates, p. 176 A ; Philo, *Quod omn. prob. liber*, p. 609), v. 3, 2 Macc. vi. 12, 3 Macc. v. 33, συστέλλω means to *humble*, to *overthrow*, which does not suit with καιρός. The correct translation is that of the *old* interpreters (so also de Wette, Osiander, Ewald, Maier, Hofmann, Weiss) : *compressed*, i.e. *brought within narrow limits* (Plato, *Legg.* iii. p. 691 E ; Demosth. 309. 2 ; Lucian, *Icar.* 12 ; comp. συστολή, *abbreviation*). The space of time remaining is only of *brief duration*. In connection with this, τὸ λοιπὸν is generally made to refer to what *precedes* :¹ the time is *henceforth* (*in posterum*, see Fritzsche, *ad Matth.* p. 777 ; Kühner, *ad Xen. Anab.* ii. 2. 5) *cut short*,—a mode of connecting the words, however, which makes τὸ λοιπὸν convey a superfluous idea. Others hold that it refers to what *follows*,² and that in the sense of “*ergo agendum, quod sequitur*,” Estius ; comp. Luther : “*weiter ist das die Meinung*.” But how obscure the expression would thus be ! The *telic* sense of ἵνα, too, would be deprived of its logical reference to what precedes. Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Hofmann, adopting the reading which puts ἐστὶ before τὸ λοιπὸν (see the critical remarks), place a comma after the verb : συννεσταλμ. ἐστίν, τὸ λοιπὸν ἵνα κ.τ.λ., i.e. *the time is shortened, in order that in future*, etc. Comp. as regards this position for ἵνα, on Eph. iii. 18 ; Gal. ii. 10 ; Rom. xi. 31. This is preferable, because τὸ λοιπὸν is thus put emphatically forward in its essential and important meaning : in order that *henceforward* these relationships may be dealt with in a wholly different way than hitherto. Comp. upon the subject-matter, Matt. xxiv. 42 ff. — ἵνα introduces the *design* of συννεσταλμ. ἐστὶ in the arrangements of God.³ Beza, Billroth, Schrader, Hofmann make it refer to τοῦτο δὲ φημι. But we may see from παράγει γὰρ κ.τ.λ. in ver. 31 that Paul was thinking of so great results as the aim, not of his *assertion*, but of the *thing* asserted,—a view which agrees thoroughly with his religious contemplation of the world, Rom. v. 20, vii. 13, viii. 17, xi. 31 ; 2 Cor. iv. 7, vii. 9, *al.* He looks upon everything as fitted into the plan of moral redemption under the government of God. — ἵνα καὶ οἱ ἔχ. γυν. κ.τ.λ.] The meaning is : *In order that each may keep himself inwardly independent of the relations of his earthly life*,—that the husband should not by his married state lose the moral freedom of his position of a Christian in heart and life ; that the sorrowful should not do so through his tribulation, nor the joyful through his good fortune, nor the merchantman through his gain, nor he

¹ Peshito, Chrysostom, Theodoret, Theophylact, Beza, Grotius, *al.*, including Billroth, Olshausen, de Wette, Osiander, Reiche, Ewald, Maier, Neander.

² Tertullian, Cyprian, Jerome, Vulgate, Erasmus, Calvin, *al.*, including Heydenreich

and Rückert.

³ There is therefore no ground here for beginning a new sentence with τὸ λοιπὸν ἵνα, and taking ἵνα in the imperative sense (comp. on v. 2). So Laurent, *neut. Stud.* p. 130.

who uses the world through his use of it. We see the reverse of this independent attitude in Luke xiv. 18–20. There the heart cleaves to temporal things as its treasure, Matt. vi. 21. By giving *ἵνα* its proper reference, it is made clear that Paul neither designs to *lay down rules* here (“that the married ought to be as though unmarried,” etc., Rückert, with many others), nor to *depict the uncertainty of temporal possessions* (Grotius and Pott) ; which latter meaning is what Reiche also brings out : “quandoquidem propediem mutata rerum terrestrium facie, laetitiae et tristitiae causis mox evanidis, tempus deficiet malis bonisve sensu percipiendis.” — καὶ οἱ ἔχοντες γυν.] *Even the married.* This καὶ singles out the first point for special emphasis, because it was the one on which the discussion chiefly turned ; καὶ in the instances which follow is the simple *and*. — οἱ ἀγοράζ. ὥς μὴ κατέχ.] *the buyers, as not possessing* (2 Cor. vi. 10), that, namely, which they buy. — ὥς μὴ καταχρ.] may mean, like the Latin *abuti*, so far as the word in itself is concerned, either : *as not abusing it*,¹ or : *as not using it* (Vulgate, Calvin, Grotius, Estius, *al.*, including Pott, Rückert, de Wette, Osiander). Comp. ix. 18. So frequently in Greek writers ; see Krebs, p. 291 ; Loesner, p. 280 f. The latter of the two meanings should have the preference here from the analogy of the preceding clauses. The compound verb—which ought not to have the sense of *at one's own pleasure* (Hofmann) imported into it—serves merely to give greater emphasis to the idea ; see Bremi, *ad Isocr. Panegy.* § ix. p. 21 ; Herodian. viii. 4. 22. Translate : *Those who use this* (pre-Messianic) *world as not making use of it.* There is no reason either for taking καταχρ. in the sense of *using up* (Reiche, Ewald), because this meaning, although in itself admissible on linguistic grounds (Diog. Laert. v. 69 ; Lys. p. 153. 46 ; Isocr. p. 55 D), only weakens the force of the antithesis in a way contrary to the relation subsisting between all the other antitheses. (v) — χρῆσθαι in the sense of *uti* with an accusative (see the critical remarks) occurs here only in the N. T. ;² in classic Greek not at all (in Xen. *Ages.* xi. 11, the true reading is τῷ μεγάλῳ φρονι), and seldom in later Greek (Schaefer, *ad Gregor. Cor.* p. 691). See also Bornemann, *Acta apost.* I. p. 222. Καταχρῆσθαι, however, often occurs in that sense with the accusative (Lucian, *Prom.* 4 ; Plut. *Demetr.* 23), and it may have been occasioned here by the writer's thinking of the compound verb. Comp. Buttman, *neut. Gr.* p. 157 f. [E. T. 181].

Vv. 31, 32. Lachmann places only a comma after τούτου, in which he is followed by Billroth, Rückert, Olshausen, and Maier. From παράγει on to εἶναι would thus form collectively a ground for the preceding καὶ οἱ χρώμενοι κ.τ.λ. This would be correct, if the foregoing words conveyed an exhortation, or if *ἵνα* in ver. 29 were dependent upon τοῦτο δέ φημι. Since, however, what is conveyed in the preceding statement is the *design of God*, the full stop after τούτου should be retained ; the words from παράγει on to τούτου form thus a confirmatory addition to οἱ χρώμενοι . . . καταχρώμενοι, while

¹ Syriac, Tertullian, Theodoret, Theophylact, Oecumenius, Luther, Beza, Cornelius à Lapide, *al.*, including Olshausen and Billroth, the latter of whom considers that

Paul gives us here the explanation of his foregoing paradox.

² Hence Fritzsche (*de conform. Lachm.* p. 31) rejects it as an error of the copyists.

θέλω δέ, again, marks the advance to something new, to *what Paul, in view of this passing away of the fashion of this world, now desires of his readers*, namely, that they should be ἀμέριμνοι, *i.e. without worldly cares* (see vv. 33, 34). — παράγει] *is passing away*, in accordance with the καιρὸς συννεσταλμ. in ver. 29. Τὸ σχῆμα, *habitus, i.e. status externus*. See Wetstein. It is not the transitory character of earthly things in general that is meant (so most of the older expositors and Billroth; comp. also Hofmann), but the expiry of the αἰὼν οὗτος, the end of which is the world-embracing catastrophe of the Parousia, the transformation of the form of this world, and therewith of its whole temporal constitution, into the new heaven and the new earth. Comp. 1 John ii. 17; Rev. xxi. 1; Rom. viii. 19 ff.; 2 Pet. iii. 10; Matt. v. 18. Grotius, Valckenaer, and Flatt are wrong in holding that the meaning is: “non manebunt, quae nunc sunt, res tranquillae, sed mutabuntur in turbidas,” and that the expression is taken from the language of the theatre (changing the scene, Eurip. *Ion*. 166; Lucian, *Herm*. 86). Our rendering is demanded by vv. 26, 29, and by the eschatological view of the N. T. generally. — θέλω δὲ κ.τ.λ.] Comp. ἐγὼ δὲ ὑμ. φείδομαι in ver. 28. — τὰ τοῦ Κυρίου (the cause of Christ) is more precisely defined by what follows. — The reading ἀρέσει, *how he shall please*, and ἀρέσῃ, *how he may please* (see Stallbaum, *ad Sympos.* p. 216 C; Fritzsche, *ad Marc.* p. 350), are equally suitable so far as the sense is concerned.

Ver. 34. Taking the reading μεμέρ. κ. ἡ γυνή κ. ἡ παρθένος (see the critical remarks), we have: *The wife, too, and the maiden are divided*,¹ *i.e. they are severed from each other as regards their interests, are separate in what they care for, personae quae diversae trahuntur*. The way in which μερίζεσθαι is used (see Reiche, *Comment. crit.* I. p. 195) to denote division into different tendencies, views, party-positions, is well known (Matt. xii. 25, 26; Mark iii. 24–26; Polybius, viii. 23. 9; Herodian, iii. 10. 6, iv. 3. 3); but the expression is *selected* here in reference to the different kinds of μεριμνᾶν. Theophylact says well: οὐ τὴν αὐτὴν ἔχουσι φροντίδα, ἀλλὰ μεμερισμέναι εἰς ταῖς σπουδαῖς, καὶ ἡ μὲν περὶ ἄλλα σπουδάζει, ἡ δὲ περὶ ἄλλα. Comp. Theodoret. The simple rendering: “*There is a difference*” (Chrysostom, Luther, Grotius, Mosheim, Zachariae, Heydenreich, and others), would still conduct one back to the sense *divisa est*, but would give too general and meaningless an idea. — Μεμέρ. is in the *singular*, because it stands at the head of the sentence, and ἡ γυνή κ. ἡ παρθένος embraces the female sex as a whole made up of two halves. Comp. Kühner, II. p. 58 f.; Bernhardt, p. 416; Butt-

¹ If we adopt Lachmann's reading (defended especially by Hammond among the older expositors), which Ewald also follows (leaving out, however, the second ἡ ἄγαμος) the meaning will be: *The married man cares . . . how he may please his wife, and is divided (in his interest). And the unmarried wife (widowed or divorced) and the unmarried maiden cares, etc.* Hofmann, too, prefers this reading, taking the καί, which it has before ἡ γυνή, in the sense of *also*. The

betrothed maiden, in his opinion, is no longer ἄγαμος. But in the whole context there is only the simple distinction made between married and unmarried persons. Betrothed maidens, too, belong to the latter class; comp. ver. 36: γαμείτωσαν. [Tregelles and Westcott & Hort follow Lachmann, but Tischendorf and the Canterbury Revision adhere to the received text.—T. W. C.]

mann, *neut. Gr.* p. 110 f. [E. T. 126]. — *ἵνα ἡ ἀγία κ.τ.λ.*] Comp. 2 Cor. vii. 1. This moral consecration to God of her whole personality, which she strives after, is the *πῶς ἀρέσει τῷ Κυρίῳ explicated*. One can hardly conceive that Paul *avoided* the latter phrase on the ground of possible misconstruction (Hofmann). This, considering the sacredness of the idea of *ἀρέσκειν τῷ Κυρίῳ*, would be a piece of *prudery*, which is unlike him.

NOTE.—There is no ground for inferring from vv. 32–34 that Paul, himself unwedded, looked “somewhat askance” upon marriage (Rückert). To assume any such onesidedness of view on his part would be a very hasty proceeding (see on ver. 2). On the contrary, what we have here is not his view of *how, from the nature of the case, things must necessarily subsist*,¹ but only his *experience of how in point of fact they usually did subsist*. This experience he (ὁ ἄγαμος) had arrived at, on the one hand, by consideration of his own case and that of many other unmarried persons; and, on the other, by observing the change of interests which was wont to set in with those who married. We have here, therefore, a purely *empirical* support for the preference of celibacy,—a preference, however, which with Paul is simply relative, depending upon the nearness of the Parousia and the end of the world, and also upon the subjective gift of being holy in body and spirit (comp. Acts xiv. 4). The expectation of these events being so near has remained unfulfilled, and thereby is invalidated the Pauline support which has been often found in our text for celibacy, which, as a legal requirement, is in principle thoroughly un-Pauline (comp. ver. 35). The apostle, moreover, is speaking generally, and not to one special class among his readers.

Ver. 35. Τοῦτο] refers to the recommendation of single life contained in vv. 26–34. — *πρὸς τὸ ὑμ. αὐτῶν συμφ.*] *for your own advantage*. The genitive with *συμφέρον* used as a substantive, as in x. 33; see Stallbaum, *ad Plat. Rep.* p. 338 C. — *οὐχ ἵνα κ.τ.λ.*] explaining more in detail, negatively and positively, the *πρὸς . . . συμφέρον*. *To cast a noose upon one* is a figurative expression, originally borrowed from the chase (less probably, from warfare), for the idea of *depriving of freedom* (bringing under binding and limiting relations). Comp. Prov. vii. 21, and see Wetstein and Loesner, *in loc.* The sense of “giving occasion to scruples” (Billroth, comp. Bengel) does not correspond so well with the figure and the connection. — *ἀλλὰ πρὸς τὸ εὖσχ. κ.τ.λ.*] *but to promote the habit of comeliness and undivided waiting upon the Lord* (in faithfulness to Christ). For this habit prevailed chiefly, according to the apostle’s experience, on the side of the *ἄγαμοι*; see vv. 32–34, where, too, he makes it clear beyond doubt *what comeliness* he means here—namely, such a manifestation of the inner life in all outward embodiment, as corresponds with consecration to the Lord. It is not merely *chastity* in the narrower sense that is intended, but all moral purity and consecration in so far as these manifest themselves in demeanour, in speech, gesture, bearing, etc., as the *comely form* of Christian life, as the ethical “*decorum*”

¹ Paul himself, it is plain, had intercourse with numbers of eminent servants and handmaids of the Lord (Priscilla, etc.) who

were married. This in opposition to Cropp in the *Jahrb. f. Deutsche Theol.* 1866, p. 102.

of the Christian. Its sacred *nature* and the foul *contrasts* to it are set forth in Rom. xiii. 13, 14.—The dative of appropriation, τῷ Κυρίῳ and ἀπερισπ., are conjoined with the εὐπάρ., used as a substantive, to make up the unity of the idea. — εὐπάρεδρος does not occur elsewhere. Hesychius explains it by καλῶς παραμένον. — ἀπερισπ.] “absque distractione, *i.e.* ἀνευ τοῦ μεριμνᾶν τὰ τοῦ κόσμου,” Kypke, II. p. 207. Comp. περισπᾶσθαι, Luke x. 40. Regarding the connection of the word with the later Greek, see Lobeck, *ad Phryn.* p. 415. Xenophon, *Ages.* i. 4, has ἀδιασπάστως. The adverb attaches itself to εὐπάρ. defining its meaning precisely. See on xii. 28.¹

Ver. 36. Δέ] introduces something opposed to the εὐσχημον. — ἀσχημονεῖν] means ἀσχήμονα εἶναι (comp. εὐσχημονεῖν = εὐσχήμονα εἶναι, Plat. *Legg.* v. p. 732 C), and may therefore be explained either in the *active* sense (to *act dishonourably*, conduct oneself in a dishonourable way, Plato, *Pol.* vi. p. 506 D, *Theaet.* p. 165 B ; Xen. *de re eq.* xi. 6 ; Herodian, v. 8. 16 ; Lucian, *de sacrif.* 7), or in the *passive* sense (to *have dishonour*, Eur. *Hec.* 407 ; Herodian, viii. 3. 21 ; Deut. xxv. 5 ; Ezek. xvi. 7). The former of the two interpretations is the common and the correct one, namely : *if any one thinks that he is acting dishonourably towards his virgin* (daughter or ward), *i.e.* if he thinks that he is bringing disgrace upon her ; which means, however, not the disgrace of *old maidenhood* (see Soph. *Ant.* 810 ff., *O. Rex.* 1492 ff. ; Eur. *Hel.* 291 ; comp. Ecclus. xlii. 9 ; and Lennep, *ad Phalar.* p. 362), but the dishonour of *seduction*, which the father or guardian fears he may give occasion to by refusing permission to marry ; see the following context (against Theodoret : ὁ δὲ τὴν ἀγαμίαν ἀκοσμίαν ὑπολαμβάνων, Theophylact, *al.*). Taking it in the *passive* sense, we have : *if any one thinks to have disgrace in respect of his virgin* (from seduction, or her being left unwedded). So in substance the Syriac (“despici”), Grotius, Mosheim, Zachariae, Heydenreich, Pott, Neander ; comp. Hofmann, who holds that what is here expressed is *the matter of fact of its being the father's fault* that the daughter remains unmarried. But even apart from the consideration that ἀσχημ. is *most commonly* found in the *active* meaning (see also xiii. 5), there is this against the second rendering, that ἐπί with the accusative takes for granted that ἀσχημονεῖν implies *activity*, since it states the *direction in which* it is exerted (comp. ἀσχημονεῖν εἰς τινα, Dion. Hal. ii. 26). — νομίζει] “Si perspecto filiae suae ingenio judicet, coelibatui non esse aptam,” Calvin. — ἐὰν ᾗ ὑπέρακμ.] is the case, in connection with which that εἰ δέ τις ἀσχημονεῖν, κ.τ.λ. is supposed : *in case she pass her time, pass the highest point of her youthful bloom*. As regards the ἀκμή itself, see Plato, *Rep.* p. 460 E : ἀρ' οὖν σοι ξυνδοκεῖ μέτριος χρόνος ἀκμῆς τὰ εἰκοσιν ἔτη γυναικί, ἀνδρὶ δὲ τὰ τριάκοντα, and Stallbaum, *ad hunc loc.* ; other definitions of the age may be seen in Locellà, *ad Xen. Eph.* p. 145. Paul's opinion is, that *before* the ἀκμή is reached the ἀσχημονεῖν . . . νομίζει is not likely to take place with the father or guardian of the girl ; but, judging from experience, he conceived that the maiden who is ὑπέρακμος would be more ready to yield to a lover, if she is not allowed to marry. Respecting the

¹ [The image here and the words are well illustrated by the little narrative Luke x. 39-42 in the original.—T. W. C.]

word *ὑπέρρακμ.*, which is not found in ancient Greek, see Eustath. *Il.* i. p. 11, 31 ; *Od.* p. 1915, 29. The classical writers use instead of it the perfect of *παρακμάζειν*, as in Xen. *Mem.* iv. 4. 23 ; or the adjective *παρακμαστική*, as in Galen, VI. p. 312, 14. — *καὶ οὕτως ὀφείλει γίνεσθαι*] depends on the *εἰ* :¹ *and if so* (namely, that the virgin marry), *it must be*. Thus there is added to the *subjective* condition of things, expressed in *δέ τις ἀσχημ. κ.τ.λ.*, the corresponding (not heterogeneous, as Hofmann objects) *objective* condition on the part of the maiden, whose natural temperament makes marriage needful. It is quite akin to the German phrase : *und wenn's nicht anders sein kann* [and if it cannot be otherwise] ; the expression has a somewhat euphemistic turn, as referring to the daughter's inclination to marriage, which determines the *ὀφείλει*. According to Rückert, *κ. οὕτ. ὀφ. γίν.* depends upon *εἰάν* : *and she must remain so* (i.e. *unwedded*). But the indicative *ὀφείλει* is decisive against this rendering ; and what an amount of straining is needed to make *γίνεσθαι* equivalent to *remain* ! for she *is* unwedded, and, if she so remains, cannot *become* so. — *ὃ θέλει ποιεῖτω*] not : *let him do what pleases him* (so *ordinarily* ; but this is contrary to the context ; see what follows, and the preceding *ὀφείλει*), but : *let him do what he intends* (to give his virgin in marriage). Theodoret puts it well : *τὸ δοκοῦν πραττέτω. — γαμείτωσαν*] namely, *the virgin and he who wishes to have her*. It is arbitrary, considering the general form of the whole discussion (ver. 25), to maintain, as Rückert does, that the plural refers to a particular couple respecting whom the Corinthians had asked a question. Wolf, Heydenreich, and others adopt a needlessly harsh assumption, that Paul passes here from the singular to the plural (*the virgins*). Billroth again propounds the very unlikely view that “*the youths*” should be supplied here as the subject, and *αὐτήν* as the object.

Ver. 37. *He who, on the other hand, stands stedfast in his heart*, is of a stedfast and unchangeable mind, firm in disposition and resolution. Comp. xv. 58 ; Col. i. 23, iv. 12. — *μὴ ἔχων ἀνάγκην*] *without having constraint* (objective necessity), as he, in ver. 36, whom the natural temperament of his virgin causes to fear the *ἀσχημονεῖν* before explained : — *ἐξουσίαν δὲ ἔχει κ.τ.λ.*] contrasted with the *μὴ ἔχ. ἀνάγκ.* (*δέ, but rather*) as the correlative positive state of free disposal in respect of what he himself wills. Strictly speaking, therefore, we should have the participle here, but instead, there is again a change in the construction. Comp. on iv. 14 ; Buttmann, *neut. Gr.* p. 327 f. [E. T. 382]. — *τοῦτο*] is not explained—though this is the *common* supposition—by the infinitive which follows ; were that the case, we should have *τὸ τηρεῖν*, or (as in *Od.* i. 82 ; 1 Thess. iv. 3 ; Jas. 1. 27, *al.*) the simple infin. (comp. the critical remarks). But Paul leaves the reader to gather from the connection what is meant by *τοῦτο* (namely, *not giving the maiden*

¹ Theophylact begins the apodosis with *καὶ οὕτως* : *γενέσθω, φησὶ, καὶ οὕτω. πῶς ; ὃ θέλει ποιεῖτω*. In that case *κ. οὗτος ὀφ. γίν.* would be quite superfluous, the *καί* deprived of its reference, and *οὐχ ἁμαρτ.* would not suit the obligatory *ὀφείλει*. Similarly Hofmann, who follows the same view, paraphrasing it thus : “ *This too (?) is a necessity*

arising from the nature of the case, that he do what he will.” Laurent also makes *καὶ οὕτως ὀφ. γίν.* the apodosis, expounding it to mean : *so it must be in this case also*. The clauses which follow he considers *explanatory* ; and *καί* must go back for its reference all the way to ver. 3 : *not merely in the case of the πυροῦσθαι*.

in marriage). The *design* of this τοῦτο κέκρικεν (*conclusum habet*) is then declared by τοῦ τηρεῖν : *in order to keep* (to preserve in her maidenly state) *his own maiden*. And this is not a mere periphrasis for not giving in marriage (as de Wette objects), but rather the design which the father or guardian has in his τοῦτο κέκρικεν, *by virtue of his right to dispose of his own child* : observe the emphatic τῇ νύ ἐαυτοῦ παρθένον. That *the maiden's will* should be left entirely out of account by Paul, can surprise no one who is aware of the power given to fathers among the Jews (comp. Ewald, *Alterth.* p. 267) and Greeks (Herm. *Privatalterth.* § 30. 2 ff.). — καλῶς ποιεῖ] in the sense of action, *morally right*, the positive side of the οὐχ ἀμαρτάνει of ver. 36, and in so far stronger here ; hence, too, it is represented in ver. 28 by κρεῖσσον ποιεῖ in relation to the καλῶς ποιεῖ, which is equivalent to οὐχ ἀμαρτάνει.

Ver. 38. Result of vv. 36, 37, καὶ . . . καί, *as well . . . as also*. Paul had thought of saying καλῶς ποιεῖ in the second clause also, but thereupon *strengthens his expression* (κρεῖσσον) so as to correspond with the *relations* of the two predicates, οὐχ ἀμαρτ. in ver. 36, and καλῶς ποιεῖ in ver. 37. — ὁ ἐκγαμ.] *he who marries her* (his virgin, ver. 37) *out* (gives her out of his family in marriage). This going “out” is not taken into account in the second clause. — κρεῖσσον] for see ver. 34. Regarding ἐκγαμ., comp. Matt. xxiv. 38 ; it is not preserved in Greek writers.

Vv. 39, 40. An appended rule respecting second marriage on the part of women, occasioned probably by questions from the Corinthians. — δέεται] *sc.* τῷ ἀνδρί ; she may not separate herself from him and marry another. Comp. ver. 27 ; Rom. vii. 2. — ὃ θέλει γαμηθῆναι] *to whom she desires to be married*. Comp. Mark x. 12. Γαμεῖ μὲν γὰρ ὁ ἀνὴρ, γαμεῖται δὲ ἡ γυνή, *Schol. ad Eur. Med.* 593. As regards the later form γαμηθῆναι, instead of the Attic γαμεθῆναι, see Lobeck, *ad Phryn.* p. 742. — μόνον ἐν Κυρίῳ] *only in the Lord*, not apart from Christ as the specifically determining element of the new union ; *only in a Christian way, i.e. only to a Christian, sc.* let her be married.¹ So among the early interpreters, Tertullian, Cyprian, Ambrosiaster, Jerome, Theodoret, Grotius (who puts it happily : *intra ecclesiam*), Estius, *al.*, also Olshausen and de Wette. This does not run counter to ver. 12 ff., where, in fact, *those* mixed marriages are meant which date from *the pre-Christian period*, and in which only one spouse has become Christian. Chrysostom, Theophylact, Calvin, Beza, Calovius, Wolf, and others, including Pott, Flatt, Heydenreich, Billroth, Rückert, Osiander, Neander, Maier, Ewald, all understand the phrase to mean : *in a Christian spirit, acting as a Christian should*, in the fear of the Lord ; etc. (several of the above-named interpreters, as Flatt, Rückert, Osiander, Neander, Maier, include also the point that the husband must be a Christian, or lay the chief stress upon this, as Hofmann and Weiss). But what we have here is plainly a limitation of the ὃ θέλει so emphatically put first. * Moreover, the wider and more general the meaning ascribed to ἐν Κυρίῳ, the more inappropriate it seems in connection with the foregoing definite rules, which all take for granted

¹ Paul's view, therefore, is not in accordance with the legislative permission of marriage between Christians and Jews.

that the action is Christian. — μακαριωτ.] *more blessed*, i.e. not merely more spared from troubles (vv. 26, 28), but, in accordance with the higher reference which μακάρι. invariably has in the N. T., enjoying the blessed relation, which arises out of withdrawal from worldly cares and self-surrender to Christ. See vv. 32–34. As to greater blessedness *in heaven*, which some have dragged in here in the interests of celibacy (Ambrosiaster, Cornelius à Lapide, *al.*, including Hirscher, *Moral*, III. p. 502), there is not a word of that in the text, even if we should read ἔσται in place of ἐστίν. — κατὰ τ. ἐμὴν γνώμην] ἐμὴν carries the emphasis of apostolic self-consciousness. — δοκῶ δὲ καὶ γὰρ κ.τ.λ.] so that I therefore may expect you to regard my opinion, not as a mere individual judgment, but as arrived at under the influence of the Holy Spirit which is imparted (ἔχειν) to me also, and hence as worthy to be received and followed.—Respecting δοκῶ, *mihi videor*, the note of Estius may suffice: “minus dicit, plus volens intelligi.” Comp. iv. 9. — καὶ γὰρ] like other teachers who have received His gifts.—In the two expressions coming together—of which δοκῶ has a touch of irony (comp. Dissen, *ad Dem. de Cor.* p. 230 f.)—there is implied a side-glance, but whether precisely at the *Petrine party* (Neander, Rübiger, *al.*) may be doubted. It is safer to say generally: at opponents of his full standing as an apostle in Corinth. Comp. Calvin. (w)

NOTES BY AMERICAN EDITOR.

(R) *Paul's command and the Lord's.* Ver. 10.

It is important to insist upon the author's explanation of the words, “I command; yet not I, but the Lord.” This is not a distinction between what is inspired and what is not. What the Apostle means is simply that the Corinthians had no need to apply to him for instruction on the matter of divorce, because Christ had already taught that the marriage bond could not be dissolved at the option of the parties.

(S) “*Now are they holy.*” Ver. 14.

Stanley, while agreeing with the opinion that this verse is against the practice of infant baptism in Paul's time, yet says that it asserts the principle upon which that ordinance is founded, viz. that family ties do in themselves consecrate those who are bound by them, and that the children of Christian parents may therefore be considered as among the people of God, and that from this would follow the natural consequence that the whole family would participate in the same rites as belonged properly, and in the highest sense, only to those members or that member of it who was strictly a believer. *Est matrimonium Christianum est soboles Christiana* (Bengel).

(T) *Desertion a cause of divorce.* Ver. 15.

Hodge's explanation of this matter is somewhat different and apparently better: “There is no conflict here between Christ's command and Paul's instructions. Both say, a man cannot put away his wife (nor of course a wife her husband) on account of difference of religion, or for any other reason but the one above specified (Matt. ver. 32). The Apostle only adds that if the believ-

ing party be, without just cause, put away, he or she is free." The marriage contract thus wilfully broken no longer binds. Hence wilful desertion is judged to be a legitimate ground of divorce.

(v) "*Use it rather.*" Ver. 21.

No question of scholarship has been more vexed in earlier or later times than the one whether the Apostle here recommends the slave to choose liberty or a continuance in bondage. The arguments on both sides are nearly equally balanced. (See a neat summation in Stanley *in loco*.) Meyer's reference to the *καί* may be turned in this way: "Wert thou called, being a slave? Care not for it; but if also (*i.e.*, in addition to your being called), thou canst become free, prefer to use the opportunity." So Hodge, Speaker's Com., Principal Brown, Beet. Kling (in Lange) and Ellicott's Com. take the other view.

(v) "*Using as not abusing.*" Ver. 30.

On the author's view of these words it is obvious to remark that if the Apostle meant the same thing in each clause, it is impossible to conceive why in one case he used the simple verb, and in the other a compound one. The force of the preposition is usually to make the verb mean using to the full or to excess = overusing (compare ix. 18, and for the force of the preposition the original of xi. 32). The Authorized Version is sufficiently accurate for all practical purposes. The whole clause is, as Bengel says, a true description of Christian self-denial.

(w) *Celibacy.* Ver. 40.

On the whole subject of this chapter it may be justly said that while it seems to favor celibacy, yet it does not, upon a closer view; for the preference for single life is founded expressly upon the impending calamities (26-31), and, in connection with this, on the greater freedom from worldly cares; and besides, here the Apostle is meeting a particular case of a special kind, while, when elsewhere treating largely of relative duties (Eph. vv. 22, 23), so far from speaking of marriage as an inferior state, he makes it represent the highest and holiest fellowship of which man is capable—that of Christ and His church. There is nothing in all the chapter which indicates or sustains the ascetic views which prevailed a few centuries later.

It is also justly remarked that it is not often so expressly stated in the New Testament as it is here, that the practice of the highest duties of Christianity is compatible with every station and condition of life that is not in itself unlawful. If even the degraded state of slavery be consistent with the cultivation of the true spirit of Christian liberty; if even the great religious divisions of Jew and Gentile may be regarded as alike compatible with the true service of God, then in all other states of life equally the spirit of the Apostolic injunctions may be observed where, in the letter, they seem most disregarded. Freedom from earthly cares may be maintained in the married as well as in the single state; indifference to worldly gain may exist in riches, no less than in poverty; our nearness to God depends not on our desertion of one religious community for another, but on our keeping His commandments in whatever religious community His providence has placed us, whether circumcision or uncircumcision.

CHAPTER VIII.

Ver. 2. δέ] is wanting in A B $\aleph$, min. several vss. and Fathers. Deleted by Lachm. Rück. and Tisch., as Griesb., too, had recommended. Added for the sake of connection, as was also γάρ (after the first οὔτε) in ver. 8, which is omitted likewise in A B $\aleph$ 17, *al.* — εἰδέναι] It is true that A B D E F G $\aleph$, min. Clem. Nyss. Theodoret, Damasc. have ἐγνώκεναι (recommended by Griesb., adopted by Lachm. Rück. and Tisch.); but what goes before it and what follows make it clear that ἐγν. is a gloss. The reading εἶναι, too, in 39, 91, 109, tells in favour of εἰδέναι. — οὐδέπω οὐδὲν ἔγνωνκε] Lachm. and Rück. have οὐπω ἔγνων, which was recommended by Griesb. in accordance with testimony of very considerable weight, in substance the same as that in favour of ἐγνώκεναι instead of εἰδέναι. But the peculiarity of the emphatic *Recepta* does not show the hand of a gloss-writer. What has taken place has rather been the reduction of the original reading to the simple οὐπω ἔγνων, at first, perhaps, by omitting the superfluous οὐδὲν, all the more readily that it was preceded by οὐδέπω, whereupon ἔγνωνκε became transformed into ἔγνων, either from the next word beginning with K, or by the influence of the inf. γνῶναι which follows, while οὐδέπω was displaced, as in many other cases (John vii. 39; Luke xxiii. 53; Acts viii. 16), by the more familiar οὐπω. — Ver. 4. ἕτερος] is wanting in A B D E F G $\aleph^*$ min. with several vss. and Fathers. Condemned by Mill and Griesb., deleted by Lachm. and Rück. But why should any one have added ἕτερος? That it should be omitted, on the other hand, was all the more likely, because the word seemed superfluous, and might even appear offensive (“there is no other God but one” might by possibility mean: “there is but one other God”). — Ver. 7. τῇ συνειδήσει] Lachm. and Rück. read τῇ συνηθείᾳ, with A B $\aleph$, some min. Copt. Bashm. Aeth. Syr. p. (on the margin) Damasc. Approved also by Griesb. and Rinck. τῇ συνειδήσει, however, as the more difficult reading, should be retained. See also Reiche, *Comment. crit.* I. p. 200 ff. It was noted on the margin how the συνείδησις τοῦ εἰδώλου arose, namely, by τῇ συνηθείᾳ, and then this phrase easily crept into the place of the original τ. συνειδ. — It is preferable, however, to put ἕως ἄρτι before τοῦ εἰδώλου (Lachm. Rück. and Tisch.), with B D E F G $\aleph$ 31, 37, 116, and several vss. and Fathers; in the *Recepta* we have transposition in the interest of the construction. — Ver. 8. παρίστησι] A B $\aleph$, min. Copt. Bashm. Clem. Origen (twice), Athan. Cyr. Damasc. have παραστήσει. Recommended by Griesb., adopted by Lachm. Rück. and Tisch. Rightly; the presents which follow gave rise to the same tense here. Συνίστησι, which has but weak support, is a gloss. — There is considerable evidence (especially A B $\aleph$) in favour of omitting the γάρ, and putting the negative clause first in what follows (Lachm. Tisch.). The transcriber would have a mechanical inclination to place the positive half of the statement first. — Ver. 9. There is decisive evidence for reading ἀσθενέσιν instead of the *Recepta* ἀσθενοῦσιν. — Ver. 11. καὶ ἀπολεῖται] In place of καί, A has οὖν after the verb (so Rück.), while B $\aleph^*$ 17, Copt. Bashm. Goth. Clem. have γάρ, which is adopted by Lachm. and Tisch. The last of the

three readings is the true one ; γάρ not being understood, was explained in some cases by καί, in others by οὖν. Instead of ἀπολείται, read with Lachm. Rück. and Tisch. ἀπόλλυται, on the authority of A B D* 8, several min. Copt. Goth. Clem. Bas. Antioch. Chrys. Theodoret, and Damasc. The future arises from a mechanical alteration of the text after οἰκοδομηθ. — ἀδελφός] Lachm. Rück. and Tisch. have ὁ ἀδελφός after γνώσει, which has conclusive evidence in its favour. The *Recepta* originated in a mistaken attempt to help out the construction. — ἐπί] Lachm. Rück. and Tisch. read ἐν, which is supported by decisive testimony.

CONTENTS.—To eat flesh offered to idols is a thing morally indifferent for all who understand rightly what an idol is (vv. 1–6). Still, for the sake of those who are more weak, we should refrain from so eating, if it is a stumbling-block to them (vv. 7–13).

Ver. 1. Δέ] marks the transition to a *new* subject, which the queries from Corinth led the apostle to discuss. — περὶ τῶν εἰδωλοῦ.] Since this is taken up again in ver. 4, it is clear that vv. 1–3 cannot form an independent series of thoughts (Hofmann), but that ver. 3 is the *close* of a *logical parenthesis* (not a *grammatical* one, because at what is its true beginning the construction undergoes no interruption). It is not to be made to *begin* at ὅτι (*for*) πάντες, as is done by Luther, Bos, Er. Schmid, Raphel, Wolf, Bengel, Valckenauer, and others, among whom are Olshausen and Maier ; for the fact that ἡ γνώσις φυσιοῦ stands unconnected with what precedes it, and the sense of ὅτι in ver. 4 (*that*), are decisive against this. The true commencement is only at ἡ γνώσις φυσιοῦ (so, with older commentators, Pott, Rückert, de Wette, Osiander, Ewald, Neander ; Billroth is undecided on the point), so that the preceding γνώσιν ἔχομεν has very naturally given occasion to the warnings which begin with ἡ γνώσις φυσιοῦ. — εἰδωλόθυτα, *things offered to idols*, κρέα εἰδωλόθυτα, 4 Macc. v. 1, are those parts of the animals offered in heathen sacrifices, which remained over after the priests had received their share, and which were either consumed in the temple or at home in connection with sacrificial feasts (Doughty. *Anal.* I. p. 234 ff. ; Hermann, *gottesd. Alterth.* § xxviii. 22), or else (by poor or miserly persons) sold in the flesh market. Comp. on Acts xv. 20.¹ The Christians might thus easily come to eat such meat, either through being invited to a feast by heathen acquaintances (x. 27), or, again, by buying it in the market (x. 25), and thereby offence would be given to scrupulous consciences ; while, on the other hand, those of a freer spirit, and with more of Paul's own mode of thinking, might be apt to make light of the matter, and withal forget how a Christian ought to spare the weak. To assign the strong and the weak to one or other of the four *parties* respectively, is, to say the least of it, a very uncertain pro-

¹ Paul, however, makes no reference to the decree of the apostles either here or elsewhere, which is in keeping with his consciousness of his own direct and independent apostolic dignity. Comp. on Acts *loc. cit.*, and on Gal., Introd. § 3. Moreover, this very chapter, along with chap. x., shows plainly that, in virtue of his inde-

pendent position as an apostle, he had early enough shaken himself clear of all applications of the temporary agreement come to at Jerusalem which might conflict, upon points in themselves indifferent, with the principles elsewhere enunciated by him, although coupling this with a wise forbearance towards those who were weak in the faith.

cess, whether we are disposed to find the former in the Christ-party (Olshausen, Jaeger) or in the Apollonians (Räbiger). As regards the weak, see ver. 7, and the remark subjoined to it. — *οἶδαμεν*] should not be joined directly with *περὶ κ.τ.λ.*, but the latter clause is to be taken as in vii. 1 : *Now, as respects meat offered to idols, we know that*, etc. Hofmann, following Semler, but in the face of all the Versions and Fathers, reads *οἶδα μὲν* (*I know, indeed, that*), by which he gains nothing but a *μὲν solitarium*, which would be all the more uncalled for, seeing that the corresponding antithetic clause, where he ought to find *ἡ δὲ γνῶσις*, follows immediately. There is still less reason here for writing it as two words than in Rom. vii. 14, where it is, in point of fact, succeed by a *δέ*. The *subject* of *οἶδαμεν* consists of all those, besides the apostle himself, of whom the *γνῶσιν ἔχομεν* holds good, that is to say, of *Paul and the* (as regards this point) *more enlightened Christians : I and those like myself* in this. Theophylact puts it rightly (comp. Chrysostom); *πρὸς τοὺς τελείους διαλέγεται, ἀφ' ἑαυτῶν τοὺς ἀτελεστέρους*. Since *οἶδαμεν* and *ἔχομεν* must have one and the same subject, Rückert is wrong in taking the first indefinitely : *it is well known*. Olshausen understands it of *all Christians*, and seeks to remove the contradiction between that and ver. 7 in this way : he distinguishes *γνῶσις* and *ἡ γνῶσις*, making the former to be *a certain ground of knowledge* in general ; the latter, *the specific knowledge of how the form and the power of idolatry stand related to each other*. But the *γνῶσις* in ver. 1, although without the article, has been already defined very exactly as regards its contents by *περὶ τ. εἰδωλ.*, and still more by ver. 4, so that *ἡ γνῶσις* in ver. 7 can mean nothing else but *the γνῶσις under discussion* ; consequently the contradiction would remain. De Wette's exposition is better ; he holds that in ver. 1 Paul is speaking quite generally, and, as it were, theoretically (comp. also Ewald), while in ver. 7 he refers specially to the Corinthians. But such a theoretic generality would have needed to be expressed by the first person alone *without πάντες*, if the *οὐκ ἐν πᾶσιν* in ver. 7 were to have any logical pertinence ; while, on the other hand, if we are to maintain that general meaning in ver. 1 as it stands, we should have arbitrarily to insert into the *πάντες* there the unexpressed idea, “*properly speaking, all Christians as such*” (Ewald), or to give to the *ἔχομεν* the sense of “*should have*.”¹ Others, following Er. Schmid (“we at Corinth are all wise enough”), regard *the Corinthians* as the subject, and take (Nösselt, *Opuscula*, II. p. 152, Rosenmüller, Pott, Heydenreich, Flatt) the words *περὶ . . . ἔχομεν*, and then *ὅτι οὐδὲν εἰδωλον* in ver. 4 on to ver. 6, as quotations from the Corinthian letter, the refutation of which begins with ver. 7. But this is unnatural ; for in that case Paul would have brought the passage *ἡ γνῶσις φνισιοῦ κ.τ.λ.*, on to ver. 3, into his refutation as well. Further, it is contrary to the apostle's habitual way of writing, for he always marks out the words of an opponent as such by some formula ; and lastly, it is quite unnecessary, seeing that the supposed contradiction between ver. 1 and ver. 7 vanishes on considering the change of person (from the *first* in ver. 1 to the *third* in ver. 7). — *γνῶσιν*] have knowledge ; of what ? is plain from the

¹ So Elwert, *Progr.*, *Quaestiones ad philol. sacram. N. T.*, Tübing. 1860, p. 17.

context, namely, *of the way in which flesh offered to idols should be regarded*. The contents of the statement are more fully expressed in ver. 4.

Vv. 1-3. Now follows the caveat inserted parenthetically with a view to *γνῶσιν ἔχομεν*. — The *article* turns the abstract *γνῶσις* into a noun appellative. — The *knowledge* (in and by itself, namely) *puffeth up* (iv. 6, v. 2); *but the love* (to the brethren; comp. Rom. xiv. 14, 15) *edifieth* (x. 23), furthers the progress of the church (viewed as *οἰκοδομὴ Θεοῦ*, see iii. 9) towards Christian perfection. It is, indeed, the necessary *ἡγεμονικόν* to the effectively sympathetic and humble *application* of the knowledge. Comp. chap. xiii., especially ver. 4. — Vv. 2 and 3 explain the preceding statement, both from the wrong nature of the supposed knowledge and from the preciousness of love to God. — Since the *γνῶσις* in and by itself, divorced from love, is never a real knowledge, but only such as a man fancies himself to have (iii. 18), Paul characterizes here what he before designated by *ἡ γνῶσις* as a *δοκεῖν εἰδέναι τι*; and since the love to the brethren does not essentially differ from the love to God, but is simply its expression in the fellowship of believers, he now characterizes the former as *ἀγαπᾶν τὸν Θεόν*. One can hardly mistake the impress of deep and pregnant meaning in this whole passage, so like the manner of John, especially in his Epistles. — *τί]* *anything whatever*, any object of the *γνῶσις*. Pott and Platt interpret: *something wonderful*; but this does not correspond so well with the sententious character of the verse. — *οὐδέπω κ.τ.λ.]* he knows *nothing at all as yet* in such a way as to bring it under the name of knowledge, as that must by moral necessity be constituted from the Christian standpoint. The conceit of knowledge is onesided, superficial, partial, false, unpractical, in its character. In order to the *γινῶναι καθὼς δεῖ* we must of necessity have love, which regulates the knowledge morally, gives it proper depth, and makes it practically salutary. Comp. xiii. 2. As regards the repetition of the negative (Luke xxiii. 53; John xix. 41; Acts viii. 16), Schömann, *ad Is.* p. 469; Stallbaum, *ad Plat. Crat.* p. 398 E). — Ver. 3. *οὗτος]* with emphasis: *he*, to the exclusion of the other who prides himself on his knowledge. — *ἐγνωσται ὑπ' αὐτοῦ]* This is rationalized by Billroth in his usual fashion into: “*God recognizes Himself in him*,” but it means simply: *this man is known by Him*. The statement is a pregnant one. Instead of making it logically complete by saying: “it holds good of such a man not merely that he *knows* in the true sense, but also that he *is known* of God,” the apostle states simply the latter and greater truth, which of itself implies the former. The *ἐγνωσται ὑπ' αὐτοῦ* shows the *importance and preciousness* of the love spoken of, in accordance with its *holiness*; for if God *knows* a man, that implies a relation between God and him of no indifferent or ineffective kind, but an *activity* of God, which *passes over* to the man, so that he as the object of the divine knowledge experiences also the efficacy of the *disposition* in and with which God knows him, of His love, gracious care, etc. (x) The idea, therefore, is that of the *effective* divine knowledge, which becomes part of the inner *experience* of the man, and which is the *causa salutis*,¹ so that God in thus

¹ Comp. *Constit. ap.* v. 16. 3: *μὴ γινώσκοντες Θεὸν διὰ τοῦ κηρύγματος πιστεύσαντες ἔγνωτε*

knowing the man carries out that saving fellowship with him, which was purposed in His own counsel, Ps. i. 6 ; Gal. iv. 9 ; 2 Tim. ii. 19. Comp. Hofmann, *Schriftbeweis*, I. p. 258 ff. See also on xiii. 12. Other interpreters supply the thought *ut suum discipulum* (Erasmus) or *inter filios* (Calvin), and the like. Comp. Usteri, *Lehrbegriff*, p. 283. But that is to insert a meaning not in the text. Others, again, take it as *approbatus est* (Piscator, Clericus, Gataker, Grotius, Wolf, Mosheim, Semler, Morus, Vater, *al.*, following Fathers in Suicer, *Theol.* I. p. 762). But this is as much against linguistic usage (see on Rom. vii. 15) as Augustine's *edoctus est* (so, too, Beza, Pareus, Er. Schmid, and others, including Nösselt, Rosenmüller, Heydenreich, Pott, Flatt), so that the passive would correspond to a Hophal. Olshausen's mysterious fancy is contrary to the whole context, which demands the simple conception of *knowing*; he finds in γινώσκειν (as in 17, see on Matt. i. 25) the *bridal* (?) relation of the soul to God.

Ver. 4. οὖν] *igitur*, takes up again the interrupted statement (ver. 1) ; comp. xi. 20, and see on Mark iii. 31, and Baeumlein, *Partik.* p. 177. — τῆς βρώσ. τ. εἰδ.] more precise definition of the indefinite τῶν εἰδωλοθ., ver. 1. There is no reason any more than formerly for writing οἶδαμεν here as οἶδα μέν with Hofmann. — ὅτι οὐδὲν εἰδωλ. ἐν κόσμῳ] *that there is not an idol in the world.* Paul's meaning here is not: what the heathen adore as gods is something absolutely without existence (see, on the contrary, ver. 5 and x. 20) ; but : no heathen god exists as the being which the heathen supposes him to be ; and so there is no adequate reality, corresponding to the heathen conception of a god Jupiter, Apollo, etc. (γ) Most of the old interpreters, with the Vulgate, Luther, and Beza (also more recently, Michaelis, Rosenmüller, Flatt, Heydenreich), took οὐδέν to mean *nil*: "that an idol is a nonentity." Comp. Jer. x. 3 ; Isa. xli. 24, *al.*, Addit. to Esth. iv. 8 ; Sanhedr. f. 63. 2 : "Noverant utique Israelitae, *idolum nihil esse.*" Comp. also Joseph. *Antt.* viii. 13. 6. But this must be held incorrect, seeing that ἐν τ. κόσμῳ does not harmonize with it, and because of the parallel expression οὐδεὶς Θεός. — καὶ ὅτι οὐδεὶς κ.τ.λ.] *and that there is no other God but one.* The εἰ μὴ refers simply to οὐδεὶς Θεός, not to ἕτερος. See on Gal. i. 19.

Vv. 5, 6. Confirmatory elucidation of the preceding statement ὅτι οὐδὲν εἰδωλον . . . εἰ μὴ εἷς.

Ver. 5. *For* (γάρ) *even* (καὶ) *if really* (εἴπερ, see Hartung, *Partikell.* I. p. 343 ; Baeumlein, *Partik.* p. 202) *there exist so-called gods, whether in heaven or on earth.* Heathenism conceived heaven and earth to be filled with beings whom they called gods (Jupiter, Apollo, and so forth ; gods of the woods and the rivers, etc.). Paul does not admit the existence of such gods,¹ but merely *supposes* it, and that with καὶ εἴπερ, *i.e.* *even in the case that, if there be in reality, if after all*, whereby of course "in incerto relinquitur, utrum jure an injuria sumatur" (Hermann, *ad Viger.* p. 834), this, however, not being implied in εἴπερ by itself, but by the connection in which it stands here.

αὐτόν, μᾶλλον δὲ ἐγνώσθητε ὅτι π' αὐτοῦ
ἐκ τῆς Ἰησοῦ τοῦ σωτῆρος κ. λυτρωτοῦ τῶν
ἐλπιζόντων ἐπ' αὐτόν.

¹ We know from x. 20 that he did not al-

low that the gods as such existed at all, but held those beings regarded as gods to be demons. Comp. Weiss, *bibl. Theol.* p. 279.

Comp. Rom. viii. 9, 17, etc.; and see Baumelein, *l.c.* The supposed case—the reality of which is still left to stand on its own footing—is then established, so far as its possibility is concerned, by ὡςπερ κ.τ.λ.: *as there are, indeed, gods many and lords many.* What is conceded here is the premiss from which that possibility may be drawn as a consequence. If there exist, that is to say, a multitude of superhuman beings, who come under the category of θεοί (in the wider sense) and κύριοι, then we must admit that it is possible that those whom the heathen call gods—Jupiter, Apollo, and so on—have an actual existence.¹ The θεοὶ πολλοί and κύριοι πολλοί are, as the connection necessarily leads us to understand, not human rulers, deified kings, and the like, but the *superhuman powers* (angels), of whom it is said in Deut. x. 17: ὁ γὰρ Κύριος ὁ Θεὸς ὑμῶν, οὗτος Θεὸς τῶν θεῶν καὶ Κύριος τῶν κυρίων.² Comp. Ps. cxxxvi. 2, 3. Most commentators take εἰσί as said *e gentiliū persuasione* (so Pott, Platt, Heydenreich, de Wette, Ewald, Neander, Maier), which would give as the sense of the whole: “*if there be in reality so-called gods among the heathen, as, indeed, they speak of many gods and lords*” (de Wette). But this explanation runs counter to the fact that εἰσί is put first with emphasis: and the *e gentiliū persuasione* is neither expressed nor hinted at in the text, but is a pure insertion of the commentators, and that with the less warrant, seeing that it is the emphatic ἡμῖν in the apodosis that first introduces a contrast with others. This applies, too, against the arbitrary distinction made by Billroth, who maintains that only the first εἰσί denotes real existence (the λεγόμεν. θεοί being demons, x. 20,) while with the second we should supply: *in the view of the heathen.* Rückert takes both the first and second εἰσί in the right sense, but makes εἰπερ mean,—contrary to the rules of the language,—*although it must be conceded that* (which is not its meaning even in such passages as those given by Kühner, II. § 824, note 2), and supposes that the apostle conceived the angels and demons to be the realities answering to the λεγόμεν. θεοί.³—As regards καὶ εἰ, *etiam, tum, si*, which marks the contents of the conditional clause as *uncertain*, comp. on Mark xiv. 29; and see Hermann, *ad Viger.* p. 832; Stallbaum, *ad Plat. Apol.* p. 32 A. It is here the “*etiamsi de re in cogitatione posita*,” Ellendt, *Lex. Soph.* I. p. 884. Examples of καὶ γὰρ εἰ, *for even if*, may be seen in Hartung, *Partikell.* I. p. 141.

Ver. 6. Apodosis: *yet have we Christians but one God, the Father, etc.* Therefore: οἶδαμεν ὅτι οὐδὲν εἰδωλον κ.τ.λ. The εἰσὶν to be supplied after ἡμῖν is the simple verb substantive. — ἀλλ’] as in iv. 15. — Θεὸς ὁ πατήρ] might be taken together here as *forming one conception*, like Κύριος ὁ Θεός (Fritzsche, *ad*

¹ The meaning of the verse, therefore, freely rendered, would be: *For even if we suppose that the gods of the heathen mythology have a real existence, which is no such absurd supposition, seeing that there is not merely One God and One Lord* (in the wider sense of these words), *but gods many and lords many*: still for us Christians, etc., ver. 6. Hofmann agrees substantially with our exposition of the passage. See also his *Schriftbew.* I. p. 348.

² [Hodge, *in loco*, sustains this view strongly.—T. W. C.]

³ There is no ground whatever for bringing in the demons here from x. 20 (this in opposition to Olshausen and others). The second part of the verse, which makes no further mention of λεγομένοις θεοῖς, should have sufficed of itself to prevent this; still more the correlation in which the many gods and lords stand to the εἰς Θεός and εἰς Κύριος in ver. 6.

Matt. p. 168) : it agrees better, however, with the εἰς Κύριος 'I. X. which follows, to understand ὁ πατήρ as in apposition to Θεός and defining it more precisely. By ὁ πατήρ, and the relative definitions of it which follow, the εἰς Θεός has its specific character assigned to it, and that in such a way as to make the reader feel, from the relation of the One God to the world, and from his own relation to Him, how the Christian, despite that *plurality* of gods, comes to rest in the thought of the *unity* of God, and how idols are with him put out of account altogether. Comp. Hofmann, *Schriftbew.* I. p. 348. — ὁ πατήρ] in the *Christian* sense, according to the idea of the *νιοθεσία* of Christians. Rom. viii. 15 ; Gal. iii. 26. — ἐξ οὗ τὰ πάντα] as to primary origin. See on Rom. xi. 36. — καὶ ἡμεῖς εἰς αὐτόν] *i.e.* and we Christians are destined to serve His purposes : He is our *End*. Here again, after the καί, we have the deviation from the relative construction, common with the apostle from his preference for direct address. Comp. on vii. 13. Bernhardy, p. 304. It is arbitrary to take εἰς in such a narrow sense as is given to it by Piscator, Grotius, Rosenmüller, *al.* : for God's honour ; but positively incorrect to take it for ἐν, with Beza, Calvin, and others ; or for ἐξ, with Schulz, Heydenreich, and Pott. Billroth interprets it in Hegelian fashion : "that man should be *towards* God, should return *into* Him as his First Cause, not remain *for himself*." This has only a seeming likeness to Augustine's "Fecisti me ad te, et inquietum est cor nostrum, donec requiescat in te," *Conf.* i. 1. Olshausen, following older expositors (Calovius, Estius, *al.*), finds the Trinity here also (comp. on Rom. xi. 36), which is obviously wrong, were it only for this reason, that we have neither one subject alone named in this passage (as at least in Rom. *loc. cit.*), nor three, but two.¹ He holds, with Billroth (comp. also Neander), that the εἰς refers to the agency of the Holy Spirit in bringing all back to its primary origin.² — δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα] does not apply to the new moral creation (Grotius, Stolz, Pott), and consequently cannot include all that is involved in *redemption and atonement* (Baur, *neut. Theol.* p. 193), which is clearly against the sense of the preceding τὰ πάντα ; but it means that Jesus Christ, in His premundane existence, as the Son of God (not as the Ideal Man or the like) as πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως (in John's phrase, as Λόγος), was He through whom³ God brought about the creation of the world. See on Col. i. 15 ff. Comp. John i. 3. Usteri, *Lehrbegriff*, p. 315 ff. ; Rübiger, *Christol. Paul.* p. 29 ff. ; Hahn, *Theol. d. N. T.* § 85 ; Lechler, p. 51 f. ; Weiss, *bibl. Theol.* p. 318. Philo calls the λόγος the ὄργανον, δι' οὗ κατεσκευάσθη (ὁ κόσμος). See *de Cherub.* I. p. 162. In Rom. xi. 36, δι' οὗ is said of God, and the reference is therefore of a different kind

¹ Hence we find, in some of the later codd. and Fathers, additional clauses respecting the Spirit, namely, καὶ ἐν πνεύμα ἁγίῳ, ἐν ᾧ τὰ πάντα κ. ἡμεῖς ἐν αὐτῷ, and : καὶ ἐν πνεύμα ἁγ. δι' οὗ πάντα. But so early an expositor as Chrysostom remarks expressly that the Spirit is *not* mentioned here.

² In order to bring out the "all" (Rom. xi. 36), Olshausen affirms : "Insomuch as the church is destined to receive all men in-

to it, and insomuch as it exerts a reflex restorative influence even upon the κτίσις (Rom. viii. 19 ff.), those who believe are equivalent to things as a whole." An instance—to be taken as a warning—of exegetical subjectivity in the interest of dogmatic preconception.

³ Not ἐξ οὗ which holds only of the Father, although εἰς ὃν could be said of the Son also (comp. Col. i. 16).

thán here. — καὶ ἡμεῖς δι' αὐτοῦ] is not to be referred to the physical creation (Rückert) ; for the idea thus elicited would not only be tame and obvious of itself, but also out of keeping with what has previously been stated of God, the second clause in which, κ. ἡμεῖς εἰς αὐτόν, adds a different, namely, an *ethical* relation. The reference here is to the *new creation of believers* (Eph. ii. 10 ; 2 Cor. v. 17 ; Gal. vi. 15) ; this is effected by God *through Christ*, who, as in the physical creation, is the *causa medians*. Just as we Christians have but one God, the true Creator, whose designs we serve ; so, too, we have but *one Lord, the true Mediator*, to whom all things owe their being, and we our *Christian* existence, that which we are as *Christians*. This “*one God and one Lord*” shuts out all the heathen gods as such, so far as the Christian consciousness is concerned.

Ver. 7. “We know that there is no idol, etc. ; however, this γνῶσις that we speak of (ἡ) is not in all ; but doubtless (the δέ as in vii. 37, and very often —so ver. 9—after a negative clause) there are many who,” etc. — τῇ συνειδήσει ἕως ἄρτι τοῦ εἰδώλου] *in virtue of their conscience till now regarding the idol*, i.e. through this, that their moral consciousness is still burdened with the conception of an actual existence of the heathen gods as such. The opposite of the συνείδησις τοῦ εἰδώλου is : οἶδαμεν, ὅτι οὐδὲν εἶδωλον ἐν κόσμῳ, ver. 4. Because those who are weak in the faith have not risen to this conviction, but still remain under the belief that the idols really exist, therefore they eat the meat offered to idols *as meat offered to idols*, i.e. their conception in eating it is, not that it is the same as other meat, and consequently to be partaken of without scruple and without receiving any idolatrous defilement, but that it is really meat consecrated to an idol which is assumed to exist, and hence that to eat of it is sinful.¹ — συνείδησις²] means simply *conscience* (neither *judicium*, as many maintain, nor *obscure conception*, as Schulz would have it ; Billroth's rendering is better, though still inexact : “conviction that there are εἰδωλα ;” so also Reiche, Maier), and τοῦ εἰδώλου is the *object* of the moral consciousness, the *article* indicating the idol in a *generic* way. As to the gen. with συνείδ., comp. Heb. x. 2 ; 1 Pet. ii. 19 ; so also frequently in Greek writers. The context shows what the relation is as regards meaning (here it is that which is inherent in the consciousness as its contents). — ἕως ἄρτι] marks off the time more sharply than “always as yet” (Hofmann), which would be ἔτι ; it means, “*up to this very hour*” (iv. 13, xv. 6, and in all other passages). Taking the usual order of the words, it would most naturally attach itself to ἐσθίουσι ; but since the place which on critical grounds must be assigned to it is before εἰδώλου (see the critical remarks), it must be joined to τῇ συνειδήσει. We might have expected τῇ ἕως ἄρτι συνειδήσει τοῦ εἰδώλου or τῇ συνειδήσει τοῦ εἰδώλου τῇ ἕως ἄρτι ; even in Greek authors, however, one finds adverbial attributives used in this loose adjectival way without any connecting article ; and Paul himself in other places employs

¹ [The later critical editors all adopt the other reading συνηθεία = *by familiar intercourse with*, or as the Revised Version has it, “being used to.”—T. W. C.]

² See generally, besides von Zetschwitz

(*Profangrät.* pp. 52 ff., 75) Kohler, *Schriftgemässe Lehre vom Gew.*, 1864 ; Delitzsch, *Psychol.* p. 133 ff. ; Lindes, *de vi et ratione συνειδήσεως ex N. T.* Lund, 1866 ; R. Hofmann, *Lehre vom Gew.*, Leipz. 1866.

this mode of expression (see on xii. 28 ; 2 Cor. xi. 23 ; Phil. i. 26 ; Gal. i. 13). — It is an artificial construction, and without sufficient ground, to supply a second *συνειδήσει* (without the article) after *τῇ συνειδ.*, and connect *ἕως ἄρτι τοῦ εἰδώλου* with this. — *ἀσθενὴς οὖσα*] *because it is weak* ; for were it strong, it would no longer have suffered itself to be morally bound by the conception of idols, and hence would not have been *defiled* (made conscious of guilt) by eating, because in that case the eating would be *ἐκ πίστεως* (Rom. xiv. 23). *Μολύνειν* (comp. 2 Cor. vii. 1), of *ethical* defilement ; also in Ecclus. xxi. 28 ; Porphy. *de Abstin.* i. 42 ; Synesius, *Ep.* 5. Comp. Titus i. 15 : *μαίνειν*. Observe here *the two sides* of the conscience : it was weak *to begin with*, and *afterwards* it is defiled as well.

NOTE.—The *ἕως ἄρτι*, which points back to their state before conversion, puts it beyond question that the *weak* brethren are not to be conceived of as *Jewish-Christians*, but as *Gentiles*, whose conscience was still burdened with the belief, brought with them from the heathen period of their lives, that the idol was a divine reality. They must have supposed the idols to be subordinate divine beings (not *demons*, as Neander thought, which, according to x. 20, would have been the *correct* conception), from whose worship they had been brought to that of the one Supreme God ; so that they could not look upon the consumption of sacrificial flesh as a mere harmless eating of meat, but had their conscience always hampered with the thought that by so eating they were brought into contact with those idol-deities. Theophylact puts it rightly (comp. Chrysostom) : *ἦσαν γὰρ πολλοὶ ἐξ εἰδωλολατρίας τῇ πίστει προσελθόντες οἱ ἕως ἄρτι, τουτέστι καὶ μετὰ τὸ πιστεῦσαι, τὰ εἰδωλόθυτα ἐσθίουσιν ὡς εἰδωλόθυτα*. Theodoret says : *οὐχ ἡ βρωσις μολύνει, ἀλλὰ ἡ συνειδήσις τὴν τελείαν οὐ δεξαμένη γινώσκει, ἔτι δὲ τῇ πλάνῃ τῶν εἰδώλων κατεχομένη*. This in opposition to the common view, that the weak brethren are to be sought among the *Petrine party*. Schenkel even goes the length of explaining the *name* of that party from the abstinence of the members from sacrificial flesh ; therein they held strictly, he thinks, to the Apostolic Council, whose decree had been arrived at specially through the influence of *Peter* (?). The correct view, that the weak brethren were *Gentile-Christians*, is advocated also by Hofmann, and finds expression in Lachmann's reading of *συνηθεία*.

Ver. 8 f. This is not an objection urged by the Corinthians in defence of their eating meat offered to idols, which is then followed, in ver. 9, by the apostle's reply (Calvin, Pareus, Mosheim, Zachariae, Pott, Heydenreich, Billroth) ; for here, too, we have no formula to mark that an objection is being adduced, and those who ate the sacrificial flesh would in their interest have required to write : *οὔτε ἐὰν μὴ φάγωμεν, περισσεύομεν, οὔτε ἐὰν φάγωμεν, ὑστερούμεθα*. No, Paul is now going on (the advance being indicated by *δέ*) to show what regard should be paid to those weaker brethren : “ *Now, food is not the determining element in the Christian's relation to God ; to abstain from it does no harm, and to partake of it gives no advantage* (see the critical remarks). *Therefore* (ver. 9) *ye ought not to make yourselves a cause of stumbling to the weak through your liberty to eat sacrificial flesh*.” If food were not a thing indifferent,—if abstinence from it brought loss, and partaking of it blessing with God,—then it would be our duty *not* thus to adapt ourselves

to the weak. — οὐ παραστήσει] *it will not* (in any case which may arise ; future) *present us to God ; non exhibebit nos Deo, i.e. it will not affect the position of our moral character in the judgment of God*, either for the worse or for the better. We have thus a description of an *adiaphoron* in its relation to God. Comp. Bengel, Osiander, Hofmann. Most interpreters take the word in the sense of *commendabit*, or, keeping by the *Rec. παρίστησι*, *commendat*, as if it were *συνιστήσει* or *συνίστησι*. This is untenable according to the rules of the language ; and it is illogical besides, for *both* the cases which follow οὔτε . . . οὔτε are included under the collective conception, οὐ παραστ. τ. Θεῷ.¹ — ὥστεροῦμ.] *do we come short*, do we lack anything in our relation to God. The opposite of this (comp. Phil. iv. 12) is περισσ. : *we have an overflowing abundance*, something more than mere sufficiency in our relation to God ; τουτέστιν εὐδοκимоῦμεν παρὰ τῷ Θεῷ ὡς ἀγαθόν τι ποιήσαντες καὶ μέγα, Chrysostom. — βλέπετε δέ] The δέ, *now then*, introduces what is their positive duty, as contrasted with the foregoing negative state of the case. — πρόσκομμα] *stumbling*, i.e. occasion to act contrary to conscience. Comp. Rom. xiv. 13.

Ver. 10. Τίς] any such weak brother, namely. — τὸν ἔχοντα γνῶσιν] *quippe qui cognitionem habes*, in significant apposition to σέ. It is just this, which the weaker believer knows respecting the stronger, that leads him astray. — ἐν εἰδωλείῳ κατακείμενον] Their liberal-mindedness went, it seems, so far that they even reclined at table *in idol-temples* with those who held the sacrificial feasts there. The *absolute prohibition* of this abuse of liberty (which follows afterwards in x. 14–22) would not have come in suitably here, where *the connection of itself naturally led* the apostle simply to point out in the way of warning the bearing of such conduct upon the weak. — Instances of the use of εἰδωλεῖον—which does not occur in profane writers—from the LXX. and the Apocrypha, may be seen in Schleusner, *Thes.* II. p. 246. See also Eustath. *ad Od.* vi. p. 263. 17. In the *Fragm. Soph.* 152 (Dind.), the true reading is ἐδῶλια. — οἰκοδομηθήσεται] is neither a *vox media* (Clericus, Elsner, Wolf, *al.*), nor does it mean *impelletur* (Castalio, Kypke, Hermann, Stolz, *al.*) or *confirmabitur* (Syr., Grotius, Zachariae, Schulz, Billroth), but as always in the N. T. : *will be built up, advanced in a Christian frame of mind, so as to eat* (εἰς τὸ ἐσθ.). To be brought to eat sacrificial flesh *while one is weak* (ἀσθεν. ὄντος, opposite of γνῶσιν ἔχειν), is, as Calvin rightly expresses it, a *ruinosa aedificatio*, seeing that the foundation which it ought to have, the πίστις, is wanting. We have here, therefore, an ironically significant *antiphrasis* ; without the ἀσθ. ὄντος it might be a case of a real οἰκοδομεῖσθαι ; things being as they are, however, it can be so *only in appearance*, and, in reality, it is the very *opposite*.² *Egregie aedificabitur!* The hypothesis (Storr. *Opusc.* II. p. 275 f. ; Rosenmüller, Flatt, comp. Neander), that Paul borrows the word from the letter of the Corinthians to him (in which they

¹ This holds also against the modification which Valckenaer, Rückert, and de Wette have made upon the ordinary view : “ does not bring us near to God, does not put us into a position to appear before Him.” Comp. Theophylact : οὐκ οἰκειοῖ ἡμᾶς τῷ Θεῷ.

² Wetstein compares with this the passage in *Nedarim*, f. 40. 1 : “ Si dixerint tibi juniores aedifica, et seniores demolire, audi seniores et non audi juniores, quia aedificatio juniorum est demolitio, et demolitio seniorum est aedificatio.”

had said that by partaking of sacrificial flesh people edify the weak), and gives it back to them in an antiphrastic way, cannot be established, and is unnecessary.

Ver 11. Ἀπόλλυται (“terrificum verbum,” Clarius) γάρ unfolds the meaning of the antiphrastic element of the preceding οἰκοδ., the γάρ introducing the *answer* (Hartung, I. p. 477 ; Klotz, *ad Devar.* p. 240 ; Baeumlein, *Part.* p. 72), in which the apostle’s irony loses itself in the deep earnestness which underlies it : *he is in truth utterly ruined*, etc. — ἀπόλλυται is meant here, as in Rom. xiv. 15, of destruction κατ’ ἐξοχήν, the *eternal* ἀπώλεια to which a man becomes liable when he falls from the life of faith into that of sin through violation of his conscience. See on Rom. xiv. 15. Billroth, indeed, holds the γάρ here to be quite inexplicable, unless we take ἀπόλλ. simply in the sense of *is led astray* (but see the critical remarks) ; while Rückert declares the γάρ utterly useless. Nevertheless, ἀπόλλυται κ.τ.λ. makes it clear and unmistakable how the case stands with the preceding οἰκοδομηθ., so that γάρ is logically correct. — ἐν τῇ σῇ γνώσει] belongs to ἀπολλ. : *by means of thy knowledge*, so that it through the use thou hast made of it, has occasioned this destruction. Ἐπὶ (see the critical remarks) would be : *upon thy knowledge*, so that it was the *ground* of what took place. — ὁ ἀδελφ. δι’ ὃν X. ἀπ.] a weighty twofold motive for not bringing about such a result. Comp. Rom. xiv. 15. The δι’ ὃν X. ἀπ. is *frustrated* by the ἀπολλ.! Comp. ver. 12. Bengel says well in reference to δι’ ὃν : “ut doceamur, quid nos fratrum causa debeamus.” Respecting διά, comp. Rom. iv. 25.

Ver. 12. Οὕτω] When ye sin against the brethren *in this way*, as described in vv. 10, 11. — καὶ] *and especially*. — τύπτοντες] in *substance* the same thing as μολύνοντες in ver. 7, only expressed by a different metaphor, which makes the *cruelty* of the procedure more apparent. What befits a weak conscience is *forbearance*, not that it should morally *receive blows*, should be *smitten* through offence done to it as with a wounding weapon (Hom. *Il.* xix. 125 ; Herod. iii. 64 ; Xen. *Cyr.* v. 4. 5 ; Prov. xxvi. 22), so that now, instead of being but a *weak*, it becomes a *bad* conscience. — αὐτῶν] put first because correlative to the εἰς Χριστόν which follows ; in the latter is finally concentrated the whole *heinousness* of the offence.

Ver. 13. Comp. Rom. xiv. 21. The classic διόπερ, *for that very reason* (because the offence in question is such a heinous one), meets us with certainty in the N. T. only here and x. 14. — βρῶμα] *any kind of food*, indefinitely. Instead now of saying in the apodosis : “then I will never more eat of it,” etc., he names the *special kind* of food (κρέα) presenting itself in *application* to the subject discussed, by abstaining from which, at any rate, the use of *sacrificial* flesh and the σκάνδαλον thereby given would be excluded. — οὐ μὴ φάγω] “Accommodat suae personae, ut facilius persuadeat,” Piscator. The expression is not by way of exhortation, but of *assurance*, “then I will *certainly not eat*,” etc. Τοῦτο ὡς διδάσκαλος ἄριστος τὸ δι’ ἑαυτοῦ παιδεύειν ἂ λέγει, Chrysostom. — εἰς τ. αἰῶνα] *to all eternity, nevermore* ; hyperbolical mode of expressing the most thorough readiness. Comp. as regards the idea, Rom. xiv. 21. — ἵνα μὴ κ.τ.λ.] For this is what I should bring about, if he holds the flesh which I eat to be sacrificial flesh (ver. 9). Observe the emphatic repeti-

tion of the words, and the different order in which *σκανδαλ.* and *τ. ἀδελφ. μ.* are placed.—That the maxim here enunciated cannot be an universal rule *in adiaphoris*, had been pointed out already by Erasmus. Comp. Gal. ii. 5 with 1 Cor. ix. 19 ff. and Acts xvi. 3. It does not hold, when the truth of the gospel comes to be at stake. Comp. Gal. ii. 14. (z)

NOTES BY AMERICAN EDITOR.

(x) “*Is known of Him.*” Ver. 3.

The pregnant meaning of this phrase is well given in Cremer's *Lexicon sub voce*. No lower view will adequately meet the demands of the connection.—The “knowledge” spoken of in the first verse is well defined by Stanley as not secular knowledge as distinguished from divine or theological, but knowledge of divine things without love, knowledge by itself as distinguished from knowledge of divine things with love. The same writer develops the Apostle's figure thus : “Knowledge may indeed expand and enlarge the mind, but it is by mere inflation, as of a bubble, which bursts and vanishes away. Love alone succeeds in building up an edifice, tier above tier, solid alike in its superstructure and in its basis, so as to last forever.

(y) *An idol is nothing.* Ver. 4.

Stanley, in opposition to the opinion stated in the text, says that as the word *idol* can hardly be used in an abstract sense in Greek any more than in English, and as in x. 19 it is not so much the non-existence as the nothingness of the idol which is asserted, it is on the whole better to adopt the more common interpretation, viz., that an idol has no strength and no meaning in any part of the universe ; its existence is confined to the mere image in the temple, and has no further influence elsewhere. Hodge, on the other hand, insists that in x. 19 Paul says that the idols are demons, and says that the meaning here is that there are no such beings in the universe as the heathen conceived their gods to be. (So Kling, Principal Brown, Canon Evans, and Beet.) On the next verse he remarks that there are two things which the Apostle means to deny : 1. The existence of such beings as the heathen conceived their gods to be : 2. That the supernatural beings who do really exist, and who are called gods, are really divine. They are mere creatures.

(z) *The rule of expediency.* Ver. 13.

It is impossible to state more strongly than does the Apostle the obligation to refrain from indulging in things indifferent when the use of them is an occasion of sin to others. Yet it is never to be forgotten that this by its very nature is a principle the application of which must be left to every man's conscience in the sight of God. No rule of conduct founded on expediency can be enforced by church discipline. It was right in Paul to refuse to eat flesh for fear of causing others to offend ; but he could not justly have been subjected to censure, had he seen fit to eat it. The same principle is illustrated in reference to circumcision. The Apostle utterly refused to circumcise Titus, and yet he circumcised

Timothy, in both cases acting wisely and conscientiously. Whenever a thing is right or wrong, according to circumstances, every man must have the right to judge of those circumstances. Otherwise he is judged of another man's conscience, a new rule of duty is introduced, and the category of *adiaphora*, which has existed in every system of ethics from the beginning, is simply abolished.

CHAPTER IX.

Ver. 1. οὐκ εἰμὶ ἐλεύθερος ; οὐκ εἰμὶ ἀπ.] So A B $\aleph$, min., and most of the vss., with Tertullian, Origen, Ambrosiast. Aug. Pelag. Cassiodorus, Bede, Griesb. Schulz, Lachm. Tisch. Elz. inverts the order of the questions, and is defended by Pott, Rinck, Reiche, *Comm. crit.* I. p. 206 ff., Hofmann. But it was very natural to transfer οὐκ εἰμὶ ἀπ. to the first place as the *more important* point, and the one *first* expounded in detail by the apostle himself (vv. 1-3). — Ver. 2. τῆς ἐμῆς] Lachm. Rück. Tisch. read μου τῆς, with B $\aleph$, 17, 31, 46, Or. Rightly ; the *Recepta* is a more precise definition of the meaning inserted in view of ver. 3. Had μου crept in from the τὸ ἔργον μου in ver. 1, it would have been put after ἀποστολῆς. — Ver. 6. τοῦ] is wanting, it is true, in A B D* F G $\aleph$, 17, 46, Isidor., and is deleted consequently by Lachm. and Rück. ; but the omission was very naturally suggested by vv. 4, 5. — Ver. 7. ἐκ τοῦ καρποῦ] Lachm. Rück. Tisch. read τὸν καρπὸν, with A B C* D* F G $\aleph$ *, 17, 46, 137, Sahid. Boern. Tol. Flor. Harl. Vulg. ms. Bede. The *Recepta* is an alteration in accordance with what follows, made without observing the difference in meaning. — Ver. 8. ἡ οὐχὶ καὶ κ.τ.λ.] There is decisive testimony in favour of ἡ καὶ ὁ νόμος ταῦτα οὐ λέγει ; approved by Griesb., adopted by Lachm. Rück. Tisch. It was altered because not understood. — Ver. 10. ἐπ' ἐλπίδι τοῦ μετέχειν] So Griesb. Lachm. Scholz, Rück. Tisch., with A B C $\aleph$ *, 10, 17, 71, Syr. utr. Erp. Copt. Sahid. Baschm. Arm. Or. Eus. Cyr. The *Recepta* again (defended by Reiche) is : τῆς ἐλπίδος αὐτοῦ μετέχειν ἐπ' ἐλπίδι. Since, however, this ἐπ' ἐλπίδι is omitted also by D* F G, 46, it has such a weight of evidence against it¹ that it must be rejected at once ; τῆς ἐλπίδος αὐτοῦ μετέχειν, again, is so plain as regards its meaning, that had it been the original reading it could hardly have given rise to any change. If, on the other hand, it was not observed that we have to supply ἀλοῶν after ἀλοῶν, the ἐπ' ἐλπίδι τοῦ μετέχειν remained unintelligible, and τῆς ἐλπίδος αὐτοῦ was put in as a gloss to obviate the difficulty ; then this mistaken gloss in some cases *displaced* the original words, in others, got *mixed up* with them (Elz.). — Ver. 11. θερίσομεν] C D E F G L, min. Vulg. It. Theodoret, have θερίσωμεν. So Lachm. on the margin. Tischendorf is right in receiving it into the text ; grammarians took offence at the subjunctive after εἰ. — Ver. 13. There is decisive evidence for reading παρεδρ. here with Lachm. Rück. Tisch. (approved also by Griesb.), and in ver. 15 οὐ κέχρημαι οὐδενὶ τ., with Griesb. Lachm. Scholz, Rück. Tisch. — Ver. 15. ἵνα τις κενώσῃ] There is great diversity here. B D* $\aleph$ *, Sahid. Baschm. have οὐδεὶς κενώσει (so Lachm.). A has οὐδεὶς μὴ κενώσει (so Rück.). F G, 26, give us τις κενώσει. The *Recepta*, which is specially defended by Reiche, ἵνα τις κενώσῃ, has only a partial support from C D*** E I K $\aleph$ *, the majority of the min. and vss., Chrys. Theodoret, Damasc. Theophyl. Oec., because most of these

¹ Reiche would attach this addition (which quite mars the sense in the *Recepta*) to the next verse ; but there, too, especially

as standing first, it would obtrude upon the antithesis something quite foreign to it and unsuitable.

authorities are in favour of *κενώσει*, which is adopted by Tisch. But the Received reading, as well as the *τις κενώσει*, seems to be an attempt to amend the original—but not understood—text in B (which A only intensifies), so that we ought to read *ἢ τὸ καύχημά μου οὐδεὶς κενώσει*. See the exeget. remarks on the verse. — Ver. 16. *καύχημα*] D E F G S*, It. : *χάρις*. Not strongly enough attested ; an old gloss in accordance with Luke vi. 32-34. Instead of *γάρ* after *οὐαί*, Elz. has *δέ*, but against conclusive evidence. A false correction. There are decisive grounds for reading, with Lachm. and Tisch., *εὐαγγελίσωμαι* in place of the second *εὐαγγελίζωμαι* ; the *Recepta* is a repetition from the first. — Ver. 18. Elz. and Scholz have *τοῦ Χριστοῦ* after *εὐαγγέλ.*, in opposition to decisive evidence. — Ver. 20. *μὴ ὦν αὐτὸς ὑπὸ νόμον*] omitted in Elz., but given by almost all the uncials and many vss. and Fathers. Homoeoteleuton. — Ver. 21. The genitives *Θεοῦ* and *Χριστοῦ* (Elz. and Scholz have the datives) have decisive testimony in their favour, as *κερδάνω τοὺς ἀν.* also has (so Lachm. Rück. Tisch.) ; the *Recepta* *κερδήσω ἀνόμους* was formed upon the model of ver. 20. — Ver. 22. The *ὥς* before *ἀσθ.* is wanting in A B S*, Vulg. Clar. Germ. Or. Cypr. Ambrosiast. Aug. Ambr. Bede. Deleted by Lachm. and Tisch. It was a mechanical addition on the plan of the preceding clauses. — The article before *πάντα* (Elz. Scholz) is condemned by a great preponderance of authority. — Ver. 23. *τοῦτο*] The most and best of the uncials, with the majority of vss. and Fathers, have *πάντα* ; recommended by Griesb., adopted by Lachm. Rück. Tisch. *Τοῦτο* is a gloss inserted to define the meaning more precisely ; for the same reason Sahid. Arm. read *ταῦτα δὲ πάντα*. — Ver. 27. *ὑπωπιάζω*] So Elz. Lachm. It has such a mass of weighty testimony on its side (A B C D* S, min. Or. Chrys. Theodoret, Theophyl. Oec.) that the other readings, *ὑποπιάζω* (F G K L min. Fathers) and *ὑποπιέζω* (D*** E, min. Fathers), must be rejected even on the ground of external evidence alone, all the more that the vss. *castigo* (Vulg.), *subicio*, *macero*, *affligo*, *domo*, do not show clearly which reading they follow. Notwithstanding, *ὑποπιάζω* has been defended of late, especially by Matth. (“*πιάζειν loco πιέζειν aliquos male habuit*”), Reiche, Hofm., and adopted by Tisch. It appears to have been simply the production of ignorant and mechanical transcribers, who were familiar with *πιάζω* or *πιέζω*, but took offence at *ὑπω* (with Ω).

CONTENTS.—That principle of loving self-denial which Paul had just laid down for himself *in respect of the single point in question* (viii. 13), he now confirms *by referring to his general demeanour*, of which that one resolve was merely a particular expression, and shows, in a frank, deeply impressive, and striking elucidation, how he, notwithstanding that he was free and an apostle (vv. 1-3), yet refrained from pressing his well-grounded right to have himself (and a consort as well) supported by the churches (vv. 4-18), and adapted himself to the needs of all men (vv. 19-23). His readers, therefore, should be like champions at the games in striving for the everlasting crown, preparing themselves to this end through the exercise of self-control, even as he too sought, by self-renunciation, to become worthy of the prize (vv. 24-27). Not until chap. x. does he come back from this digression to the special topic (of the sacrificial flesh) with which it stands connected. It is not of the nature of an apology as regards its whole plan and design, but only incidentally so in some isolated references (vv. 2, 3, 5, 12).

Ver. 1. The first two questions bring out the fact that he was seemingly exalted far above any such consideration and renunciation on his own part as he had announced in viii. 13 ; the third question corroborates the full purport of the second ; and the fourth represents him as proving the point by a personal appeal to his readers, whom Paul καὶ αὐτοὺς εἰς μαρτυρίαν καλεῖ, Theodoret. — ἐλεύθερος] *free*, dependent upon no man. Comp. ver. 19. — Ἰησοῦν. . . ἐώρακα] Observe the *solemnity* of the phrase ; his readers *knew* what was implied in it on his lips. The reference here is not to his having seen Christ *in His earthly life*, which would have had nothing to do with his apostleship, and which, moreover, cannot be proved to have taken place in the case of Paul at all,—certainly not from 2 Cor. v. 16,—but to the sight of the *glorified Jesus*, which was first vouchsafed near Damascus to call him to be an apostle (Acts ix. 17, xxii. 14 f., xxvi. 16 ; 1 Cor. xv. 8), and was often repeated afterwards, although in different forms (Acts xviii. 9, xxii. 17 f. ; 2 Cor. xii. 1).¹ It is an arbitrary thing to exclude those later appearances (Estius, Flatt, Billroth, Olshausen, Osiander, Hofmann), since they, too, were granted to the apostle *as such, and in connection with his apostolic relation to Christ* ; they could only serve to confirm his position of equality in the apostleship, and in this bearing were doubtless familiar to his readers from Paul's own lips. — ἐν Κυρίῳ] does not belong to ἔργον ; just as little does it to ὑμεῖς (Pott), or to ὑμεῖς ἐστε alone (Rückert), but is meant to bring out the Christian character of the *whole* τὸ ἔργον μ. ὑμεῖς ἐστε. For *out of* Christ, *in* whom (as the object of faith) the Christian lives and moves, outside of this element of the new life and standing, the Corinthians, who owed their *Christian* existence to the apostle, were not his work. The rendering : *by the help of the Lord*, is arbitrary, and does not suit the context. Some of those who adopt it understand Κύριος of God (Beza, Piscator, Flatt, Rückert, *al.*, following Chrysostom and Theophylact). Comp. iv. 15.

Vv. 2, 3. Not a parenthesis, but a statement interposed in his own defence, occasioned by οὐ τὸ ἔργον κ.τ.λ., and flowing from a heart deeply moved. — ἄλλοις] *i.e. in relation to others*, who, not belonging to your community, do not own my apostleship as valid for them.² “ We have no Apostle

¹ Baur takes advantage of this stress laid on the fact of having seen Christ, to support his hypothesis as to the close connection of the Petrine and the Christ-party. See against this Rübiger, p. 128 f. According to Schenkel, the allusion is to the visions of the Christ-party (the existence of which he has first of all to assume). The true view is, that Paul is here indicating how, in respect of this point also, he stands in no whit behind the original apostles. Ἐπειδὴ μετὰ τὴν ἀνάληψιν τοῦ σωτῆρος ἐκλήθη, εἶχον δὲ δόξαν οἱ ἀπόστολοι παρὰ πᾶσι μεγίστην ὡς τῆς τοῦ Κυρίου θεᾶς ἡξιωμένοι, καὶ τοῦτο προστέθεικεν, Theodoret. And it is no lower thing to have seen Christ in His glory than to have seen Him in His humiliation upon the earth. Comp. Calvin. As against the in-

terpretations which make this a *visionary* beholding of Christ (Baur, Holstein, *al.*), see Beyschlag in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1864, p. 220 f. How very distinctly Paul himself describes, especially in Acts xxii. 14, a *bodily* appearance ! See also Gal. i. 1, comp. with ver. 15. Nothing contrary to this can be proved from the words ἐωρακεῖναι and ὁφθῆναι (xv. 8), since these do not determine the *kind* of seeing and appearing. Comp. *e.g.* the use of the latter term in Acts vii. 26 of a bodily appearing.

² It was unquestionably by stranger Petrine Christians that the anti-Pauline influence had been exerted upon the Corinthian church. So much is clear, but nothing more. Rübiger thinks that they were the instigators of the Petrine party in Corinth.

Paul," say they ! Comp. as to the relation of the dative, viii. 6. — οὐκ εἰμί] See Winer, p. 446 [E. T. 601]. — ἀλλάγε] *still at least*. See Hermann, *ad Viger.* p. 826. The γε intensifies the ἀλλά of the apodosis (see on iv. 15, viii. 6) ; see Klotz, *ad Devar.* p. 24 f. It cannot be said with any critical certainty that ἀλλάγε ever occurs in the classics undivided (without one or more words put between the two particles). See Klotz, *l.c.* p. 15, and Heind. *ad Plat. Phaed.* p. 86 E ; Stallbaum, *ad Rep.* p. 331 B.—Taking the reading ἡ γὰρ σφραγ. μου τ. ἀποστ. (see the critical remarks), the meaning is : *my seal of apostleship*, with the emphasis on σφραγ. As to the word itself, see Rom. iv. 11. Theodoret well remarks : ἀπόδειξιν γὰρ τῶν ἀποστολικῶν κατορθωμάτων τὴν ὑμετέραν ἔχω μετὰβολήν. — ἐν Κυρίῳ] as in ver. 1 ; it belongs to the whole preceding clause : ἡ σφραγίς τ. ἐμ. ἀπ. ὑμ. ἐστε. For out of Christ the Corinthians were no seal of Paul's apostleship. See on ver. 1. They were this seal to him, inasmuch as they had become Christians through his agency (in general, not through his miracles in particular, as Flatt holds with older expositors). — ἡ ἐμὴ ἀπολογ. κ.τ.λ.] statement of *what the foregoing comes to*, added without any connective particle, and so all the more emphatic ; not merely a *repetition* of the last clause *in other words* (Hofmann), which would be an admissible interpretation only if αὕτη ἐστὶ were absent, or if ἐστὲ occurred again. — τοῖς ἐμὲ ἀνακρ.] *to those who institute an inquiry regarding me* (comp. Acts xix. 33 ; 2 Cor. xii. 19), who question my apostleship. Both ἀπολ. and ἀνακρ. are purposely-chosen *forensic* expressions. Comp. as to the latter, Luke xxiii. 14 ; Acts iv. 9, xii. 19, xxiv. 8, xxviii. 18. — αὕτη] *this*, namely, this fact, that you are the seal of mine ἀποστολή. It does not refer to *what follows* (Chrysostom, Ambrosiaster, Grotius, Calovius), for ver. 4 continues the series of questions begun in ver. 1, and what follows does not contain any further defence of his apostleship (which, moreover, would be quite unsuitable here). (A¹)—Observe, lastly, the *emphasis* of ἐμὴ and ἐμέ, expressive of a well-grounded sense of his own position.

Ver. 4 f. Returning from the digression in vv. 2, 3, Paul begins a new series of *questions*, with the view of now making good *the prerogative arising out of his apostleship*, which in point of fact he declined to exercise. — μὴ οὐκ ἔχομεν] *i.e. we surely are not destitute of the right to lead, etc. ?* Comp. Rom. x. 18 ; 1 Cor. xi. 22. The *plural* cannot be restricted in its reference to Paul alone, seeing that it has just been preceded, and is again followed in ver. 6, by the *singular*, but must imply that the apostle is thinking *both of himself and of whosoever else acts in like manner*. More particularly, ver. 6 shows that he has here in his eye, not *his companions in labour* generally (Hofmann), but Barnabas in particular besides himself (for see the μόνος in ver. 6), and him *only*. It may be added, that Calovius is right in saying, against the abuse of this passage in the interests of monasticism, that Paul is not speaking here of what "*semper et ubique vitari oporteat sed de eo tantum*

Schenkel makes them of the Christ-party. Hofmann explains the expression from the difference between the ἀποστολή τῆς περιτομῆς and that τῆς ἀκροβυστίας. But that is going too far ; for all circumcised Christians

were not anti-Pauline, and the express contrast here is with the ὑμεῖς, among whom must be included the Jewish-Christians who were in Corinth.

quod *in casu noxii scandali* infirmorum fratrum vitandum est." — φαγεῖν κ. πιεῖν] *i.e. at the cost of the churches.* To understand it of non-observance of the Jewish laws about food (Hunnius, Heydenreich, Billroth, comp. Olshausen), or of *sacrificial* flesh and wine (Schrader), is contrary to the context. See ver. 6 ff. The *right of eating and drinking*, in the sense in which the reader would *naturally understand it* as an apostolic prerogative (Luke x. 7), required nothing to be added to define it. The analogy of Matt. xi. 19 (Hofmann) has no bearing on the clause before us, the point of view there being that of *asceticism*.—The *infinitives* are exegetical, and need no τοῦ (Matt. ix. 6 ; Mark ii. 10, *al.*). — ἀδελφὴν γυν. περιάγ.] *to lead about* (along with me on my official journeys) *a sister* (a female believer) *as a wife*. The view taken by several of the Fathers (see Aug. *de op. Monach.* iv. 5, Jerome, *τινὲς* in Theodoret, Theophylact ; comp. generally, Suicer, *Thes.* I. p. 810), that a *serviens matrona* is meant (so also Erasmus, Cornelius à Lapide, and Estius,) is against the plain meaning of the words, without shadow of historical support in the life of the apostle, supposes a somewhat unseemly relation, and is contrary to the example of Peter, Matt. viii. 14.¹ It has, however, been still defended of late by Roman Catholic writers (Maier) on wholly insufficient grounds. On περιάγειν, comp. Xen. *Cyr.* ii. 2. 28 ; it occurs oftener in the middle, as Xen. *Mem.* i. 7. 2 ; Polyb. xx. 5. 8. — ὡς καὶ οἱ λοιπ. ἀπ.] It does not follow from this that *all* the other apostles were married, but the *majority* of them must have been so, otherwise the phrase, which must be meant to hold at least *a potiori*, would be unsuitable. (B¹) — καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ τοῦ Κυρίου] Now, the brethren of the Lord are in Acts i. 14 expressly distinguished from the Twelve ; further, in Gal. i. 19, James, the Lord's brother, is equally distinguished from those who were apostles in the narrower and original sense (such as Peter) ; and further still, we have no trace in any of the lists of the apostles (Matt. x. 2 f. ; Mark iii. 16 f. ; Luke vi. 14 f.) that there were "brethren of the Lord" among the Twelve, — a supposition which would also be decidedly at variance with John vii. 3 ; Mark iii. 21. The ἀδελφοὶ τοῦ Κυρίου, therefore, should not be put on a level with Cephas (Hofmann), and sought within the number of the Twelve, but are the *actual brothers* of Jesus, not His *half-brothers* merely (sons of Joseph by a former marriage), but His *uterine* brothers, later-born sons of Joseph and Mary (Matt. i. 25 ; Luke ii. 7 ; Matt. xii. 46, xiii. 55), who had become believers and entered upon apostolic work after the resurrection of Jesus (xv. 7 ; Acts i. 14), and among whom James, in particular, as president of the church in Jerusalem (Acts xv. 13, xxi. 18), had obtained a high apostolic position (Gal. ii. 9). See on Acts xii. 17 ; Gal. i. 19. This view² runs counter to what was formerly the common view, namely, that of Jerome, which still prevails with Roman Catholics, and is supported by Hengstenberg and others, that the phrase denotes the *sons of Christ's mother's sis-*

¹ Valla perceived rightly "fuisse apostolos suas uxores comitatas," but thinks that they were called *sisters*, "quod tanquam non uxores jam erant." An "*elegans argutia*" (Calvin) !

² Which is held also by de Wette, Billroth, Rückert, Osiander, Neander, and Ewald, among the more recent expositors of the passage before us.

ter, so that James, the Lord's brother, would be identical with the son of Alphaeus (but see on John xix. 25), and would bear the name of "brother of the Lord" (ΠΣ in the wider sense) as a title of honour from his near relationship to Jesus. Comp. on Matt. xii. 46. In like manner Lange, in his *apost. Zeitalter*, p. 189, understands the *Alphaeidae* to be meant; they were, he holds, the *adopted* brothers of Jesus, Joseph having *adopted* as his own the children of Alphaeus, who was his *brother*, after the latter's death. All this is nothing but arbitrary imagination, resting simply upon the false assumption that Mary brought forth Jesus, not as her *first-born* (Matt. i. 25; Luke ii. 7), but as her *only* child. Lange is wrong here in making the *καί* a proof that the brethren of the Lord were among the Twelve, and are but singled out from their number in this verse for special mention. What Paul says is rather: "as also the other apostles and the brethren of the Lord;" and then, having set before us this august circle formed by the Twelve and those brethren of the Lord closely associated with them since the resurrection of Jesus (Acts i. 14), in which, too, he himself, as an apostle, had an equal place, he singles out in conclusion the most illustrious of them all, one who was looked upon as the head of the whole circle (Gal. i. 18), by adding: "*and, i.e. and, to mention him in particular by name, Cephas;*" so that it is only the last *καί*, and not the second as well (as Hofmann, too, maintains), that carries the force of *special distinction* (Fritzsche, *ad Marc.* p. 11); comp. Mark xvi. 7. — The *design* of the whole question, *μὴ οὐκ ἔχ. ἔξουσ. ἀδελφ. γ. π.*, has no bearing upon scruples (of the Christ-party) as to marriage being allowed (Olshausen), but is closely connected with the purport of the first question, as is plain from *περιάγειν*: "Am I denied, then, the right to live at the cost of the churches, and to have, like the other apostles, etc., a consort journeying along with me from place to place?" in which latter case a similar support from the churches is, from the nature of the circumstances, and from the scope of the context (vv. 4, 6), manifestly assumed as a matter of course.—Peter's wife is called by tradition sometimes *Concordia*, sometimes *Perpetua*. See Grabe, *Spicil. Patr.* I. p. 330.

Ver. 6. 'H] *or, i.e. unless it were true that, etc.* In that case, indeed, the *ἐξουσία*, of which I spoke in vv. 4, 5, must of course be wanting! We have therefore no *third* *ἐξουσία* introduced here (Pott, Rückert), but *ἡ conveys an argument*, as it usually does. — *Βαρνάβας*] see on Acts iv. 36. He was formerly (see on Acts xv. 38) Paul's companion in his missionary labours, and as such held a high apostolic position (Gal. ii. 9). — *τοῦ μὴ ἐργάζ.*] Have we not the right to cease from working? Paul supported himself by tent-making (Acts xviii. 3); in what way Barnabas did so, is unknown. Both of them, very probably, after mutual consultation, had laid it down as a principle to maintain themselves by their own independent labour, and acted upon this rule even when working separately, whereas the rest of the apostolic teachers (see *μόνος*) claimed support from the resources of the churches. *Ἐργάζεσθαι* is the word constantly used for *working*, 2 Thess. iii. 8; Acts xviii. 3; Homer, *Il.* xviii. 469, *Od.* xiv. 272; Xen. *Cyr.* i. 6, 11, *al.* The rendering: *hoc operandi* (Vulgate and Latin Fathers), arises from a different reading (without the *μὴ*).

Ver. 7. *Proof* of this apostolic right τοῦ μὴ ἐργάζεσθαι *from three analogies in common life*, by applying which to the preachers of the gospel it is made manifest that these have the right *to live from the gospel*. “Pulchre confertur minister evangelii cum milite, vinitore, pastore,” Bengel. Comp. 2 Cor. x. 3 ff.; Matt. xx. 1; John x. 12; Acts xx. 28; Eph. iv. 5. — ἰδίοις ὀψ.] *i.e.* so that he pays his own wages (Luke iii. 14; Rom. vi. 23).—The difference of construction in the two clauses with ἐσθίει (τὸν καρπὸν, see the critical remarks, and then ἐκ), is to be regarded as simply an accidental change in the form of conception, without diversity in the substance of the thought. With ἐκ (comp. Eccus. xi. 17; Tob. i. 10, *al.*) the expression is partitive; in using the *accusative* Paul has the fruit (the grapes) in a purely objective way before his mind. See generally, Kühner, II. p. 181. The wages of shepherds in the East consists to this day in a share of the milk. See Rosenmüller, *Morgenl.* VI. p. 97.

Ver. 8. Transition to the *proof from Scripture* of the above ἐξουσία. — It is *not* supposed *surely that I speak this* (namely, what I say of that apostolic prerogative in applying to it the rule of these ordinary analogies) *after the manner of a man* (according to mere human judgment, as a purely human rule, and not a divinely given one)? *or the law too, does it not say this?* Is it silent concerning this principle? Does it contain no statement of it? — κατὰ ἄνθρ.] The opposite of this is κατὰ τὸν νόμον τοῦ Θεοῦ. Comp. on Rom. iii. 5; Gal. iii. 15. Theodoret gives the idea correctly: εἰ δέ τινι ἀνθρώπινος εἶναι ταῦτα δοκεῖ λογισμὸς, ἀκούετω τοῦ νόμον διαρρήδην διαγορεύοντος. — ἡ] as in ver. 6. “I should not speak this after man’s way of thinking, *if it were the case that* the law contained nothing of it.” This is the affirmative sense of the interrogative phrase. — καί] *too*; the law is conceived of as the higher authority coming in over and above the individual λαλῶ. — οὐ] negatives the λέγει; see the critical remarks. Comp. ver. 7. — As to the difference to be noticed between λαλῶ and λέγω, see on Rom. iii. 19; John viii. 43.

Ver. 9. Γάρ] introduces the *answer which is to prove* that the ταῦτα οὐ λέγει does not hold good. — τῷ Μωϋσ. νόμῳ] carries a certain solemnity, as coming after ὁ νόμος in ver. 8. The quotation is from Deut. xxv. 4, given exactly according to the LXX., where it is forbidden to keep the ox that drew the thrashing machine from eating by a muzzle (φιμός, κημός), which used to be done among heathen nations (Varro, i. 25; Cato, *de re rust.* 54). See Michaelis, *Mos. R.* III. § 130. The motive of the prohibition, in accordance with that spirit of tenderness towards the lower creation which breathes throughout the whole law (see Ewald, *Alterth.* p. 222), was humanity to the helpful animals. See Josephus, *Antt.* iv. 8. 21; Philo, *de Carit.* p. 711 F. The same citation is made in 1 Tim. v. 18. Comp. also *Constitt. ap.* ii. 25. 3. — φιμώσεις]—κημώσεις, which B* D* F G, Tisch. actually read, and which we should accept as genuine, since the former might easily creep into the text from the LXX. Regarding κημοῦν, *to muzzle*, comp. Xen. *de re eq.* v. 3; Poll. i. 202. As to the future with the force of an imperative (*thou wilt*—that I expect of thee—*not muzzle an ox in the thrashing-floor*), see on Matt. i. 21. — Beginning with μὴ τῶν βοῶν, there follows now the *interpretation* of this law, given in the form of a twofold question which runs on

to λέγει, first of all, negatively : *God does not surely concern Himself about oxen?* To modify this negation by an “*only*” (so Erasmus and many others, among whom is Rückert : “for nothing further than”) is unwarrantable, although even Tholuck’s view in its latest form still amounts to this (*das A. T. im N. T.*, ed. 6, p. 40). What Paul means is, that this class of creatures, the oxen, are *not* the objects of the divine solicitude in that provision of the law ; what expresses the care to be taken for the oxen, is said not for their sakes, but δι’ ἡμᾶς. Οὐ γὰρ ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀλόγων ὁ νόμος, ἀλλ’ ὑπὲρ τῶν νοῦν κ. λόγον ἔχόντων, Philo, *de Sacrif.* p. 251. Manifestly in this way the apostle *sets aside*¹ the actual *historical sense* of that prohibition (Josephus, *Antt.* iv. 8. 21) in behalf of an allegorical sense,² which, from the standpoint of a purely historic interpretation, is nothing but an *application* made “a minori ad majus” (comp. *Bava Mezia*, f. 88). But this need not surprise us, considering the freedom used in the typico-allegorical method of interpreting Scripture, which regarded such an application as the *reference* of the utterance in question designed by God, and which from *this* standpoint did not take the historical sense into account along with the other at all. The interpreter, accordingly, who proceeds upon this method with regard to any particular passage does not call in question its historical meaning *as such*, *considered in itself*, but only (as was self-evident to his readers) as regards *the higher typical destination* of the words, inasmuch as he goes to work not *as a historical*, but *as a typico-allegorical expositor*. It is in the typical destination of *the law in general* (Col. ii. 17), whereby it pointed men above and beyond itself, that such a mode of procedure finds its *justification*, and on this ground it has both its *freedom*, according as each special case may require, and at the same time its *ethical limit*, in the necessity of being in harmony with what befitted God. (c¹)

Ver. 10. Or—since that cannot be supposed—is *this* the true state of the case, *that He saith it altogether for our sakes?*—πάντως] in the sense of *in any case, wholly, absolutely*, as in v. 10, ix. 22 ; see the remarks there. Comp. Acts xviii. 21, xxi. 22, xxviii. 4, also Rom. iii. 9. The rendering : *of course, certainly*, is equally admissible as in Luke iv. 23, but would suit an affirmative statement better. Theophylact says well (following Chrysostom) : ὡς ἐπὶ ὁμολογουμένου τέθεικεν, ἵνα μὴ συγχωρήσῃ μηδ’ ὅτιοῦν ἀντειπεῖν τῷ ἀκροατῇ. — δι’ ἡμᾶς] cannot mean *men* in general (so most expositors, Hofmann, too, concurring), but must refer to the *Christian teachers* (Chrysostom, Theophylact, Estius, Rückert, Neander, *al.*) ; this necessarily follows both from the whole connection of the argument and from the ἡμεῖς in ver. 11, since it is an entirely arbitrary assumption to make the latter word have a different subject from our ἡμᾶς. — λέγει] *sc. ὁ Θεός* supplied from the foregoing clause, not ἡ γραφή (Olshausen). — γάρ] as in ver. 9. — ἐγράφη] namely, the utterance of the law cited in ver. 9.—ὅτι] cannot have an *argumentative* force (Luther, Beza,

¹ Not simply *generalizes* (Kling in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1839, p. 834 f. ; comp. Neander), nor “*subordinates the one to the other*” (Osiander), nor the like, which run counter to the plain meaning of the words. Luther’s gloss, too,

goes astray with a naïve simplicity of its own : “God cares for all things ; but He does not care that anything should be *written* for oxen, seeing that they cannot *read*.”

² Comp. also Weiss, *bibl. Theol.* p. 296.

Calvin, and others, among whom is Neander); nor is it the simple *that* of quotation (Rückert, who indeed looks upon what follows as cited from some apocryphal book, in which Ewald concurs with him), so that *ἐγράφη* would refer to the next clause,—but it is *explicative* merely (Castalio, Pott, de Wette, Osiander, *al.*, comp. also Hofmann), setting forth the typico-allegorical *contents* of these words of the law in so far as they were written δι' ἡμᾶς, that is, for the *Christian teachers*: namely, *that the plougher is bound to plough in hope, and the thrasher (is bound to thrash) in hope of having his share*. The ἀλοῶν and the ἀροτριῶν is thus no other than the *gospel teacher*, as necessarily follows from δι' ἡμᾶς; the passage of the law now under consideration gives occasion to his being *figuratively* designated (see as early expositors as Chrysostom and Theophylact) in accordance with the idea of the γεώργιον Θεοῦ (iii. 9), without, however, the two words being intended to signify *different* departments of teaching,—a notion which receives no countenance from the context. It is teaching in general that is here represented by two analogous figures. Figure *apart* therefore, the meaning is: *that the teacher, namely, is bound¹ to exercise his office of teaching, in hope to have profit therefrom*. Οὐδὲν οὖν ἕτερον τὸ στόμα ἀκήμωτον ὃν τοῦ ζῶον τούτου βοᾷ ἢ ὅτι τοὺς διδασκάλους τοὺς πονοῦντας δεῖ καὶ ἀμοιβῆς ἀπολαβεῖν, Chrysostom. It is a mistake to apply the words, as is commonly done, to the *literal* plougher and thrasher. Such a maxim of ordinary life would, it is plain, be wholly foreign to the *typico-allegorical* character of the argument, and generally to the nature of the mystical interpretation of Scripture, which Paul follows here; the result would be something unsuitably *trivial*. Nor is it simply an *application* of the *moral idea* of the precept to the spiritual work that the apostle would have his readers make; there is not the slightest trace of this in his words, but the material work serves directly as the *foil* to the spiritual. Theophylact puts it rightly: ὁ διδάσκαλος ὀφείλει ἀροτριᾶν κ. κοπιᾶν ἐπ' ἐλπίδι ἀμοιβῆς κ. ἀντιμισθίας. — ἐπ' ἐλπίδι] has the chief emphasis, and belongs to ὀφείλει, being its conditioning basis (as in Rom. iv. 18, viii. 21; Titus i. 2). *What* hope the plougher is to cherish, is self-evident, namely, to enjoy with others the fruits of his ploughing; the *reference of the figure* is obvious from the context. — τοῦ μετέχειν] to wit, of the grain thrashed. As to the *genitive*, see Rom. v. 2, *al.*

Ver. 11. Application of ver. 10, and that in such a way as to make the readers feel ὅτι μείζονα λαμβάνουσιν ἢ διδόνασιν, Chrysostom; an argument *a majori ad minus*. — ἡμεῖς] does not include Barnabas, who cannot be proved ever to have joined company again with Paul after the separation recorded in Acts xv. 39, and who certainly had no share in founding the church at Corinth. The apostle means *himself* along with his *companions* of that period, when by casting forth the seed of the gospel he founded the church to which his readers belonged (ἐσπείραμεν), Acts xviii. 5; 2 Cor. i. 19. — ἡμεῖς ὑμῖν] An emphatic juxtaposition, the emphasis of which is further heightened by the ἡμεῖς ὑμῶν which follows. — τὰ πνευματικά] *spiritual things*,

¹ Ὀφείλει *debet* (Vulgate). Hofmann goes against linguistic usage in turning it into

the sense of *being entitled*, as if he read δίκαιός ἐστι, or something to that effect.

Christian knowledge, faith, love, etc., inasmuch as these are the blessings which, *proceeding from the Holy Spirit* (Gal. v. 22), become the portion of believers through the sower's work of preaching the gospel (Matt. xiii. 3 ff.). Contrasted with these are τὰ σαρκικά, the things which have nothing to do with the Holy Spirit, but belong to the lower sphere of man's life, to his sensuous, corporeal nature, such as food, clothing, money, etc. Comp. as regards the antithesis, Rom. xv. 27: — μέγα] *res magni momenti*, Xen. *Cyrop.* vii. 5. 52, *Anab.* vii. 7. 27. It means here, from the connection: something *disproportionate*. Comp. 2 Cor. xi. 15. — ἐρίσωμεν] see the critical remarks. The *subjunctive* after εἰ “*respectum comprehendit experientiae*” (Hermann, *de partic. ἄν*, p. 97) ; see regarding this idiom on Luke ix. 13, and Hermann, *ad Viger.* p. 831 ; it occurs in Homer and the lyric poets, and, although no certain instance of it can be given from the Attic prose writers, is frequent again in later Greek.

Ver. 12. Confirmation from the example of others. — ἄλλοι] *other teachers* generally, who came into the church after the apostle and his associates (comp. iii. 10), and who were still there. Chrysostom, Theodoret, Pott, and others understand them to be *false teachers*, so as to obviate any appearance of collision between Paul and the apostles. But there was, in fact, no other apostle whatever among the rest of the *Corinthian* teachers. — τῆς ὑμῶν ἐξουσίᾳ] *the authority over you*,¹ *i.e.* according to the context: the right (πῶς) to claim their support from you. Ὑμῶν is thus the genitivus *objecti* (as in ver. 6, comp. John xvii. 2 ; Matt. x. 1, *al.*), not *subjecti*, as if it meant: “leave, *which you give*” (Schrader), which does not correspond with the conception that Paul had of the case in vv. 4–11. To understand the word in the sense of *means* (Schulz, with Castalio, Salmeron, Zeltner, Ewald), *i.e. resources*, which are at your command, may be justified by classical usage (Plato, *Legg.* viii. p. 828 D ; Thuc. i. 38. 3, vi. 31. 4), but not by that of the N. T., and is excluded here by the scope of what immediately follows. Chrysostom, in accordance with his assumption that false teachers are meant, makes the reference to be to their *tyrannical* power over the Corinthians. *Conjectures* (such as that of Olearius: ἡμῶν, which is actually the reading of 2. 52, and to which Rückert and Neander too are inclined ; or that of Cappellus and Locke: οὐσίας) are quite superfluous. — The second ἀλλά is opposed to the οὐκ ἐχρησ. Comp. Hom. *il.* i. 26 f. ; Plato, *Sympos.* p. 211 E, and often elsewhere. — μᾶλλον] *potius*, we the founders of your church. — πάντα στέγομεν] *we endure all things* (see Weststein and Kypke, II. p. 213), should be left indefinite: labours, privations and the like, arising from our not using the right in question. Comp. xiii. 7. — ἵνα μὴ ἐγκοπ. κ.τ.λ.] For how easily, supposing the apostle's labours had been less independent, or that some suspicion of self-interest, ambition, or greed of gain had rested upon him and his companions, might *hindrances* have been put in the way of the gospel as regards its reception, effect, and diffusion ! And how powerfully must that sacred cause have been com-

¹ Observe the emphasis conveyed by putting the ὑμῶν first: *over you*, who are surely

under obligation to me first of all, and not to them.

mended and furthered by such an example of noble self-denial ! Respecting ἐγκοπὴ, comp. Dion. Hal. *de comp. verb.* p. 157, 15.

Vv. 13, 14. An additional proof of the above right on the part of the teachers, drawn now from the sphere of the Israelitish theocracy, namely, from the example of the priests and the corresponding command of Christ Himself. Then, in ver. 15, ἐγὼ δὲ . . . τούτων repeats the contrast to this. —The *first* of the two parallel halves of ver. 13,¹ which together describe the ἱερατεύειν (Luke i. 7), characterizes the priests *generally* : οἱ τὰ ἱερὰ ἐργαζ., *who do the holy things i.e.*, whose work is to perform divine service ; the *second* clause again is more *specific* : “who are constantly busied at the altar of sacrifice” (προσεδρ. and παρεδρ., of an *official*, and especially of a priestly, *assidere*, Diod. Sic. i. 40 ; Josephus, *cont. Ap.* i. 7 ; Lucian, *Asin.* 5 ; Kypke, II. p. 213). As regards τὰ ἱερά, *res sacrae*, *i.e.* what belongs to the divine cultus, comp. 3 Macc. iii. 21 (according to the true reading) ; Demosth. 1300. 6 ; and often elsewhere in the classics. *They eat from the sanctuary*, inasmuch as they have their support from what is brought into the temple (sacrifices, shewbread, first-fruits, etc.) ; *they have their share with the altar of sacrifice*, inasmuch as they take to themselves their part of the offerings which belong to the altar. See Num. xviii. 8 ff. Beza puts it well : “altaris esse socios in dividenda victima.” It is incorrect to explain the first clause as referring to the *Levites* and the second to the *priests* (so Chrysostom, Theophylact, Vitringa, Wolf), for the Levites were not τὰ ἱερὰ ἐργαζόμενοι, but only ἱερόδουλοι (3 Esdr. i. 3), and therefore, in respect of their occupations, are no fitting analogues to the preachers of the gospel ; see rather Rom. xv. 16 ; Phil. ii. 17. On this ground we must refuse even to *include* the Levites here (against de Wette, Osiander, Maier, *al.*). Rückert understands both clauses to refer to the Jewish *and* heathen cultus and its ministers. But in the mind of the apostle, looking at things from the theocratic point of view of his nation, the ἱερόν and the θυσιαστ. are simply κατ' ἐξοχὴν, those of *Israel* (Rom. ix. 4) ; and how could he otherwise have said οὕτω καὶ κ.τ.λ., ver. 14, seeing that the *heathen* priestly institute was by no means of divine appointment ? For these reasons we cannot even say, with Ewald, that the words refer *primarily* indeed to Num. xviii., but are couched in such a *general* form as to apply also to the priests in the *heathen* temples. The mention of τῷ θυσιαστηρ. is especially opposed to this interpretation, since for Paul there can be but the one altar ; comp. x. 18. — οὕτω καὶ ὁ Κύριος κ.τ.λ.] *so, i.e.* in accordance with the relation of things stated in ver. 13, *hath the Lord also*, etc. Ὁ Κύριος is *Christ* ; the allusion is to such sayings of His as Matt. x. 10, Luke x. 8, here referred to as handed down by living tradition. By the καί, again, the command of *Christ* is linked to the foregoing relations *under the O. T. economy*, with

¹ The *paraphrastic* description of the priests from their employments serves to make the representation uniform with that in ver. 14. The *double* designation, however, brings out the analogy with the Christian teachers in a more clear and telling way for

the purposes of the argument. The *holy thing* at which they labour is the gospel (Rom. xv. 16), and the *offering* which they present is the faith of their converts (Phil. ii. 17), and, consequently, those converts themselves (Rom. *l.c.*).

which it corresponds (comp. Chrysostom). The order of the words is enough of itself to show that the reference is not to *God*, for in that case we must have had : οὕτω καὶ τοῖς τὸ εὐαγγ. καταγγ. ὁ Κύριος διέταξε. — For examples of the idiom ζῆν ἐκ, see Kypke.

Ver. 15. Ἐγὼ δέ] Paul now reverts to the *individual* way of expressing himself (ver. 3), effecting thereby a lively *climax* in the representation. From this point onward to the end of the chapter we have a growing torrent of animated appeal ; and in what the apostle now says regarding his mode of acting, his desire is that *he* alone should stand prominent, without concerning himself about others, and how they might act and appear in these respects. — οὐδενὶ τούτων] *none of these things* ; Oecumenius, Theophylact, Estius, Rückert, *al.*, make this refer to the *grounds* of the ἐξουσία in question which have been hitherto adduced. But there is no reason why we should not refer it simply to the immediately preceding statement as to the ordinance of Christ regarding the ἐκ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου ζῆν. Of what belongs to that ordinance (food, drink, money, clothing, etc., see Acts xx. 33)—of none of these things (τούτων) had Paul availed himself. How common it is for Greek writers also to use ταῦτα of a single thing, when considered in its different component elements, may be seen in Kühner, § 423, note ; Stallbaum, *ad Plat. Apol. Soc.* p. 19 D. Hofmann holds that the “*facts from the history of redemption*,” cited in vv. 13, 14, are meant. But οὐδενὶ implies that what is referred to is a *multitude* of things, which is summed up in τούτων. — Observe the use of the *perfect* κέχρημ. to describe a continuous course of action. It is different with ἐχρησάμ. in ver. 12.—A *full stop* should be put after τούτων ; for with οὐκ ἔγραψα δὲ ταῦτα (all from ver. 4 to ver. 15) there begins a new section in the apostle’s address. — ἵνα οὕτω κ.τ.λ.] *in order that* (for the future) *the like* (according to what I have written, namely, that the preachers of the gospel should be supported by the churches) *should be done in my case* (comp. Luke xxiii. 31 ; Matt. xvii. 12). — μᾶλλον] *potius*, namely, than let myself be supported (not *magis*, Vulgate). — ἢ τὸ καύχημα μου οὐδεὶς κενώσει] (see the critical remarks) expresses what is to take place, if the ἀποθανεῖν does not ensue. That is to say, the ἢ cannot here be the *than* of comparison,¹ as it would be were we to adopt the *Recepta*, which in fact has just arisen from men failing rightly to understand this ἢ. It means “*aut,*” or *otherwise* (comp. vii. 11 ; Acts xxiv. 20), equivalent to εἰ δὲ μή, and so specifying “*what will take place, if the thing before named does not happen*” (Baeumlein, *Partik.* p. 126), so that it is equivalent in sense to *alioquin*. See Ast, *Lex. Plat.* II. p. 12 ; Kühner, *ad Xen. Anab.* i. 4. 16 ; Ellendt, *Lex. Soph.* I. p. 750 f. ; Baeumlein, *l.c.* What Paul says is : “*Rather is it*

¹ My own former view (ed. 2) was to this effect, that instead of saying : “*Better for me to die than to take recompense*,” Paul made an aposiopesis at ἢ, breaking off there to exclaim with triumphant certainty : *My καύχημα no man will make void!* According to this, we should have to supply a dash after ἢ, and take what follows independently. I now regard this interpretation—

although approved by Winer, p. 532 [E. T. 715]—as too bold, being without analogy in the N. T., in which, as with classical writers, the suppression of the apodosis occurs only after conditional clauses (comp. Rom. ix. 22 f.). Maier has followed this view ; as does Neander, on the supposition that Lachmann’s reading were to be adopted.

good for me to die, i.e. rather is death beneficial for me, *or otherwise*, if this ἀποθανεῖν is not to ensue and I therefore am to remain alive, *no one is to make my glory void.* Comp. as to this asseveration, 2 Cor. xi. 10. — τὸ καύχημά μου κ.τ.λ.] *i.e.* No man will ever bring me to give up my principle of preaching without receiving anything in return, so as to produce the result that I can no longer have ground for glorying (καύχημα here too means *materies gloriandi*, as in v. 6 and always). Lachmann's conjecture (*Stud. u. Krit.* 1830, p. 839, and *Praef.* p. xii.), which is adopted by Billroth : νῆ τὸ καύχημά μου· οὐδεὶς κενώσει (comp. xv. 31), breaks up the passage unnecessarily ; and the same meaning would be arrived at more easily and simply, were we merely to write ἦ with the circumflex, in the sense of *sane*, which is so common in the classics (Baeumlein, *Partik.* p. 119 f.) : *in truth, no one will make my glory void.* But this use of ἦ does not occur in the N. T. Rückert's opinion is, that what we find in the old mss. gives no sense at all ;¹ we cannot tell what Paul actually wrote ; but that the best [how far ?] of what we have to choose from is the *Recepta*. Ewald, too, and Hofmann, follow the latter.— It does not follow from ver. 14 that by ἀποθανεῖν we are to understand precisely *death by famine* (so Billroth, with Theophylact, Erasmus, Piscator, *al.*) ; but the thought is generally to this effect : so far from letting myself be supported by the churches, I will rather be kept by death from this disgrace, by which, while I live, I shall let no one rob me of my glory. The idea is that of ἀντὶ τοῦ ζῆν ἀποθνήσκειν ἐν κλεῶς, Isocr. *Evag.* 1. The apostle's καύχημα would have been *made empty* (κενώσει), if he had been brought to a course of action whereby that in which he gloried would have appeared to be without reality. Comp. 2 Cor. ix. 3. He would thus have been shown to be κενσανχῆς (Homer, *Il.* viii. 230). (E¹)

Ver. 16. Why Paul has every reason (γάρ) to hold his καύχημα thus fast. *For the preaching of the gospel, taken by itself, does not put him in a position to boast himself.* All the less, therefore, can he afford to give up the only thing that does place him in such a position, namely, his preaching without recompense. — ἀνάγκη γάρ μοι ἐπὶ κ.] *sc.* εὐαγγελίζεσθαι, as is proved by what goes before. Comp. Homer, *Il.* vi. 458 : κρατερὴ δ' ἐπικεῖσσετ' ἀνάγκη, and the common phrase in the classics : ἀνάγκην ἐπιθεῖναι.— οὐαὶ γάρ μοι ἐστίν] Comp. LXX. in Hos. ix. 12. *Woe* betides him, *i.e.* God's threatened judgment will fulfil itself upon him (in the coming day of judgment), if he shall not have preached the gospel (εὐαγγελίσωμαι, see the critical remarks) ; from this is evident (γάρ) how the ἀνάγκη arises, namely, that he *must* preach ; he *cannot* give it up, without incurring eternal destruction.

Ver. 17 f. The sentence immediately preceding this verse, οὐαὶ γὰρ . . . εὐαγγ., was merely a thought interposed, a logical parenthesis, to the contents of which Paul does not again refer in what follows. In ver. 17 f., accordingly, with its γάρ, the reference is not to this preceding sentence οὐαὶ κ.τ.λ., so as to establish it by way of dilemma (which was my former

¹ The readings of B D* N* and A give the *above* sense ; F G again, with their τις κενώσει, in which it is simplest to take the τις as an *interrogative* (comp. Boerner : "*quis*

evacuat"), give the plain and good sense : *for it is better for me to die* (than that such a thing should happen in my case) ; *or who will bring my glory to nought ?*

interpretation), but to ἀνάγκη μοι ἐπίκειται, ver. 16 (comp. de Wette, Osiander, Hofmann), and that indeed in *so far as these latter words were set down to confirm the previous assertion*, ἐὰν εὐαγγελίζωμαι, οὐκ ἐστὶ μοι καύχημα. The correctness of this reference of the γάρ which introduces ver. 17 f., is confirmed by the fact that the leading conceptions in the argument of ver. 17 f., to wit, ἐκὼν and ἄκων, are correlative to the conception of ἀνάγκη in ver. 16. The γάρ in ver. 17 thus serves to justify the second γάρ in ver. 16, as we often find, both in Greek writers and in the N. T., γάρ repeated in such a significant correlation as we find here (see Fritzsche, *ad Rom.* II. p. 110 f.). In order to prove that he has *rightly* established his previous statement ἐὰν . . . καύχημα by adding ἀνάγκη γάρ μοι ἐπίκειται, the apostle argues, starting now from the opposite of that ἀνάγκη, and therefore *e contrario*, as follows : “*For supposing that I carry on my preaching* (τοῦτο πράσσω) *of free self-determination, then I have a reward, of which, consequently, I can glory ; but if I do it not of my own free will* (and this, in point of fact, was the case with the apostle), *then it is a stewardship with which I am entrusted, which therefore* (this is the purport of the interrogatory clause which follows, τίς οὖν κ.τ.λ.) *involves no reward for me.*”—From this simple course of thought—in which the μισθὸν ἔχω refers to the certain possession hereafter of the *Messianic* reward,¹ and is conceived as the more specially defined contents of the καύχημα in ver. 16,—it will be seen that the apodosis of the second half of ver. 17 is οἰκονομίαν πεπίστευμαι, that these words, consequently, should neither be put in a parenthesis nor attached to the protasis (so Knatchbull, Semler, Hofmann—comp. also his *Schriftbeweis*, II. 2, p. 332) by reading εἰ δὲ ἄκων οἶκον. πεπίστευμαι together, to which τίς οὖν κ.τ.λ. would then become the apodosis ; ²—a view under which the significant bearing of the purposefully chosen phrase οἶκον. πεπίστευμαι is entirely lost sight of. Billroth, failing to recognize how essential εἰ δὲ ἄκων, οἶκ. πεπίστ. is to the argument, makes it parenthetical, and understands ἄκων (with Bengel, Zachariae, and Schulz) as meaning *non gratis*, which is contrary to the signification of the word. Many expositors render ἐκὼν and ἄκων by “*with joy and gladness*” and “*with reluctance*” (so Calovius, Piscator, Estius, Kypke, Rosenmüller, Flatt, Pott, *al.* ; comp. also Ewald) ; but this runs counter to the fact that, as τίς οὖν . . . μισθός shows, the apostle’s own case is not the first, but the last of the two cases supposed by him, and that he found himself indeed in the official position of a preacher without having chosen it of his own free will,—being rather apprehended (Phil. ii. 12), and, through his call (Acts ix. 22, 26), as it were constrained by Christ (ἐξ ἀνάγκης ἄκων, Plato, *Legg.* v. 734 B),—

¹ On μισθὸν ἔχειν, comp. Matt. vi. 1. It is the opposite of οὐαί μοι ἐστίν, and hence μισθός cannot mean the reward which lies in the very action itself, namely, the *self-satisfaction* to which it gives rise (Hofmann).

² As regards the οὖν of the apodosis, see on Rom. ii. 17–24. It would have been exceedingly *uncalled for* after such a short and perfectly simple protasis as that in the

text. In Herodotus ix. 48, which Hofmann adduces (also Hartung, *Partik.* II. p. 22), it is otherwise (οἱ δ’ ὦν κ.τ.λ.). Moreover, it is a special peculiarity of Herodotus to put οὖν before the apodosis ; whereas, with Paul, it occurs only in Romans *loc. cit.*, where it comes in after an accumulated series of protases and, as an epanaledsis, was quite appropriate.

but, notwithstanding, pursued his work with heart and hand. — *οἰκονομίαν πεπίστ.*] *οἶκον.* has significant emphasis ; as to the construction, comp. Rom. iii. 2 ; Gal. ii. 7. If I preach *ἄκων*, so Paul holds, then the apostleship, with which I am put in trust, stands in the relation of the *stewardship of a household* (iv. 1) ; for that, too, a man receives not from his own free choice, but by the master's will, which he has to obey ; and hence it follows (*οὖν*) that *no* reward awaits me (this being the negative sense of *τίς . . . μισθός* ; comp. Matt. v. 46 ; Rom. vi. 21 ; 1 Cor. xv. 32) ; for a steward—conceived of as a slave¹—can but do his duty (Luke xvii. 10), whereas one who works of his own free will does more than he is bound to do, and so labours in a sense worthy of reward. The meanings which some expositors find in *οἶκ. πεπ.* are inserted by themselves ; thus Pott explains, “*nihilosecius peragendum est,*” comp. Schulz, Rosenmüller, Flatt, Schrader, Neander, and older interpreters ; while Grotius makes it, “*ratio mihi reddenda est impositi muneris.*” The words convey nothing more than just their simple literal meaning. What, again, is *inferred* from them, Paul himself tells us by *beginning a new sentence* with *τίς οὖν*. To suppose a middle clause omitted before this sentence (with Neander, who would insert, “How am I am now to prove that I do it of my own free will ?”) is to make a purely arbitrary interruption in the passage. — *ὁ μισθός*] *the befitting reward.* Neither here nor in the first clause is *μισθός* the same as *κἀύχημα* (Pott, Rückert, Ewald, *al.*) ; but it is viewed as standing in the relation of the inducing *cause* to that *ἐστὶ μοι κἀύχημα*, supposing the latter to take place. This also applies against Baur in the *theol. Jahrb.* 1852, p. 541 ff., who, moreover, pronounces the apostle's argument an unsound one. The distinction which Paul here makes is, in his opinion, at variance with the absolute ground of obligation in the moral consciousness, and is either purely a piece of dialectics, or has for its real basis the idea of the *opera supererogationis*. In point of fact, neither the one nor the other is the case ; but Paul is speaking of the *apostolic reward* hereafter, concerning which he was persuaded that it was not to be procured for him by his apostolic labour in itself, seeing that he had not, in truth, come to the apostleship of his own free will ; rather, in his case, must the element of free self-determination come in in another way, namely, by his labouring without receiving anything in return. In so far, accordingly, he must do something more than the other apostles in order that he might receive the reward. He had recognized this to be his peculiar duty of love, incumbent upon him also with a view to avert all ground of offence, but not as implying surplus merit. The latter notion is discovered in the text by Cornelius à Lapide and others.

Ver. 18. [*ἴνα*] is taken by Grotius as meaning *if*, by Luther and most interpreters—among whom are Rückert, de Wette, Osiander, Ewald—as used in place of the exegetical infinitive, so that it gives the answer to the foregoing question.² The first of these renderings is linguistically incor-

¹ This is not an *arbitrary* assumption (as Hofmann objects), since it is well enough known that the *οἰκονόμοι* were, as a rule, slaves.

² Wetstein, with whom Baur agrees, remarks : “*argute dictum, nullum mercedem accipere, haec mea merces est.*” But had Paul intended any such *point*, he must have

rect ; the second would have to be referred to the conception : “*I ought*,” etc., but yet does not suit the *negation* : “*I have therefore no reward*,” which had its animated expression in the question : *τίς οὖν κ.τ.λ.* It is much better to interpret *ἵνα εὐαγγ. κ.τ.λ.* as stating *the aim, according to God’s ordination*, of this negative condition. of things : *in order that I should preach without recompense* (which is the first thing to give me a prospect of reward, as being something which lies beyond my official obligation). Hofmann’s view is, that Paul asks, What reward (viz. none) *could induce him to this*, to make the gospel message free of cost ? But plainly it was just his *supporting himself* in the discharge of his vocation, *which went beyond the obligation of the οἰκονομία*, and consequently made him worthy of reward, which the work of the *οἰκονόμος*, taken by itself alone, did not do. Moreover, this interpretation of Hofmann’s would require an expression, not of the design (*ἵνα*), but of the inducing ground (such as *δι’ οὖν*). The *ἵνα* is used here, as so often in the N. T., to indicate the *divine teleology* (Winer, p. 427 [E. T. 573]). — *εὐαγγελίζ. ἀδάπ. θήσω τὸ εὐαγγ.*] *i.e. in order that I, by my preaching, may make the gospel something not connected with any outlay* (on the part of the receivers). As regards this very common use of *τίθημι*, *facio*, see Kypke and Losner *in loc.* Comp. also on Rom. iv. 17, and Hermann, *ad Viger.* p. 761. There is no need of going out of the way to render it, with Beza : *set forth*, with Grotius : *collocare*, like *τιθέναι χάριν*, or with Pott : *to set before them* (as spiritual food). “*Ἰνα*, with the *future indicative*, conveys the idea of *continuance*. See Matthiae, p. 1186. Among the older Greek writers *ὥπως* (also *ὅπως*) is ordinarily used in this connection (Matthiae, *l.c.* ; Kühner, II. p. 490), while this use of *ἵνα* is, to say the least, very doubtful (see against Elmsley, *ad Eur. Bacch.* p. 164, Hermann, *ad Soph. Oed. Col.* 155 ; Klotz, *ad Devar.* p. 629 f.) in the N. T. again, and with later authors it is certain (Winer, p. 271 [E. T. 361] ; Buttmann, *neut. Gr.* p. 202 [E. T. 234]). — *εἰς τὸ μὴ καταχρ.*] aim of his ἀδάπ. *τιθέναι τὸ εὐαγγ.* : *in order not to make use of*. To understand *καταχρ.* as meaning *to misuse* (comp. on vii. 31), would give a sense much too weak for the connection (against Beza, Calovius, and others, among whom is Ewald). The right rendering already appears in the Greek Fathers. — *ἐν τῷ εὐαγγ.*] *i.e. in docendo evangelio*. — The *ἐξουσία μου* is not exclusively that indicated in ver. 4, but the *apostolic prerogative* generally, although in *application* to this particular point.

Vv. 19-22. Confirmation of this *εἰς τὸ μὴ καταχρ. τ. ἐξ μου* by his practical procedure in other matters, which was such, that not to renounce the use of that *ἐξουσία* would simply be to contradict himself ; it would be a gross *inconsistency*. — *ἐκ πάντων*] *Masc.* It belonged to the apostolic *ἐξουσία* to put himself in bondage to no man, but to be independent of *all* (ver. 1 ; comp. Gal. i. 10) ; to hold and to make good this position of freedom towards every one, was a result flowing from, and a constituent part of, his rights as an apostle (in opposition to Hofmann, who asserts that a position precisely

expressed it by *ἄμισθος* or *ἀμισθί*. He would possibly have written *ἵνα ἄμισθος κηρύξω τὸ*

εὐαγγ., or something similar, if he had put *ἵνα* at all instead of the infinitive.

the converse of this was the only one logically tenable by the apostle).¹ Notwithstanding, Paul had made himself a bondsman to *all*, accommodating himself to their necessities in self-denial to serve them. It is only here that ἐλεύθερος occurs with ἐκ ; elsewhere (Rom. vii. 3 ; comp. Rom. vi. 18, 22, viii. 2, 21) and in Greek writers with ἀπό. — τοὺς πλείονας] *i.e.* according to the context : the greater part of the πάντες, not : more than are converted by others (Hofmann). (F¹) Comp. x. 5. By acting otherwise he would have won, it might be, only individuals here and there. — κερδήσω] namely, *for Christ and His kingdom*, by their conversion. Rückert explains it as meaning : to carry off as an advantage *for himself*, which Hofmann, too, includes. But the precise sense of the phrase must be determined by the context, which speaks in reality of the apostle's *official labours*, so that in substance the meaning is the same as that of σώσω in ver. 22. Comp. Matt. xviii. 15 ; 1 Pet. iii. 1. Regarding the form ἐκέρδησα, see Lobeck, *ad Phryn.* p. 740.

Ver. 20. Explanation in detail of the preceding verse (καὶ *exegetical*). — *To the Jews Paul became as a Jew, i.e.* in his relations to the Jews, whom he sought to convert, he behaved in Jewish fashion, observing *e.g.* Jewish customs (Acts xvi. 3, xxi. 26), availing himself of Jewish methods of teaching, etc., *in order to win Jews*. Jewish Christians are not included here (Vorstius, Billroth) ; for these were, as such, already won and saved. — τοῖς ὑπὸ νόμον] *to those under the law* ; not really different from τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις, save only that they are *designated here from their characteristic religious position*, into which Paul entered. The universal nature of the expression is enough of itself to show that Judaizing Christians cannot be intended ; nor *proselytes*,—although they are by no means to be excluded from either category,—because they, too, would not have their specific characteristic brought out by ὑπὸ νόμον. The very same reason holds against the supposition that the *rigid Jews, the Pharisees*, are meant. The first of these three views is taken by Theodoret, the second by Theodore of Mopsuestia, Grotius, Mosheim, *al.* ; Theophylact is undecided which of the two to prefer, comp. also Chrysostom ; Lightfoot and Heydenreich adopt the third. — μὴ ὡν αὐτὸς ὑπὸ νόμον] *although I myself (for my own part) am not*, etc., a caveat very naturally arising from his consciousness of the high value of his freedom as regards the law, Gal. ii. 19. There is no proof of any apologetic design here (in reference to such as might have said : Thou *must* do so and so, Rückert). Paul did *not* add any remark of this kind in connection with the preceding clause, because in respect of *nationality* he *actually was* an Ἰουδαῖος. — τοὺς ὑπὸ νόμ.] The article denotes the class of men in question.

Ver. 21. Τοῖς ἀνόμοις] *i.e.* to the heathen, Rom. ii. 12. Comp. Suicer, *Thes.* I. p. 366. — ὡς ἄνομος] by holding intercourse with them, giving up Jewish observances, teaching in Hellenic form (as at Athens, Acts xvii.). Comp.

¹ According to Hofmann, Paul establishes the negative question τίς οὖν μοι ἐστὶν ὁ μισθός by the sentence linked to it with γάρ, which states that, so far from receiving reward, he had given up his freedom, etc.,

for the same end for which he refrained from claiming support. This view is connected with his incorrect rendering of ver. 18, and falls with it.

Isidor. Pelus. ed. Paris, 1638, p. 186. — *μὴ ὦν κ.τ.λ.*] must similarly be regarded not exactly as a defence of himself (Grotius, Rückert), but as arising very naturally from the pious feeling of the apostle, who, with all the consciousness of his freedom of position towards the Mosaic law, which allowed him to be *τοῖς ἀνόμοις ὡς ἄνομος*, always recognized his subjection to the divine νόμος revealed in Christ. In spite, therefore, of his thus condescending to the ἀνόμοις, he was by no means one *without* legal obligation to God (no ἄνομος Θεοῦ¹), but one—and this is precisely what brings out the absolute character of the opposite—who stood within the sphere of legal obligation to Christ. And Paul was conscious that he stood thus in virtue of his faith in Christ, who lived in him (Gal. ii. 20), and in conformity with the gospel, which ruled him as the νόμος τοῦ πνεύματος καὶ τῆς χάριτος (Chrysostom), and was to him accordingly the higher analogue of the venerated νόμος (Rom. iii. 27), which has its fulfilment in love (Rom. xiii. 10) ; comp. Gal. vi. 2. The two genitives Θεοῦ and Χριστοῦ denote simply *in relation to, in my position towards* ; they thus give to the two notions ἄνομος and ἐννομος their definite reference.

Ver. 22. The ἀσθενεῖς are *Christians* weak as yet in discernment and moral power (viii. 7 ff. ; Rom. xiv. 1, xv. 1 ; Acts xx. 35 ; 1 Thess. v. 14). The terms κερδήσω and σώσω are not inconsistent with this view, for such weak believers would, by an inconsiderate conduct towards them, be made to stumble, and *would fall into destruction* (viii. 11 ; Rom. xiv. 15). To understand the phrase as denoting *non-Christians* from their lack of the higher powers of Christian life, especially of strength of conscience (Rückert, de Wette, Osiander, Hofmann), is against the formal use of οἱ ἀσθενεῖς, and cannot be justified by Rom. v. 6. Comp. also 2 Cor. xi. 29. — ὡς ἀσθενής] “perinde quasi simili tenerer imbecillitate,” Erasmus, *Paraphr.* — τοῖς πᾶσι κ.τ.λ.] *to all* (with whom I had to do) *I have become all*, have suited myself to them in all ways according to their circumstances. Comp. as regards πάντα γίνεσθαι,² the passages cited in Kypke, II. p. 215 f., and observe the *perfect* here at the close ; comp. Col. i. 15.—Paul did not need to say to his readers that in this whole picture of his συγκατάβασις he is expressing no mere men-pleasing or anti-Christian connivance at sin, but the practical wisdom of the truest Christian love and self-denial in the exercise of his apostolic functions ; he trusts them to understand this from their knowledge of his character. Comp. also Gal. i. 10, ii. 3–5. This practical wisdom must be all the more regarded as a fruit of *experience* under the discipline of the Spirit, when we consider how fiery and decided his natural *temperament* was. And who can estimate how much he achieved by this method of working ! Comp. Neander in opposition to Rückert’s unfavourable judgment. Augustine puts it well : “non mentientis actus, sed *compatientis*

¹ Hofmann’s conjecture, that Paul wrote Θεῷ (following it, however, with Χριστοῦ), has virtually no critical foundation, and is wholly devoid of exegetical basis. Hofmann explains the passage as if he read ἐννομος Χριστοῦ οὐκ ὦν ἄνομος Θεῷ, making Paul say of “his being shut up in the law of

Christ, that it made him one who was not without law in his relation to God.”

² Not to be confounded with the expression πάντα γίνεσθαι τινι, which means *instar omnium fieri alicui*, as in Xen. *Eph.* ii. 13 ; comp. Locella *in loc.*, p. 209.

affectus." — πάντως] *in any case* (comp. on ver. 10, and Plato, *Phaedr.* p. 266 D ; 2 Macc. iii. 13 ; 3 Macc. i. 15 ; the reverse of οὐδαμῶς, Plato, *Soph.* p. 240 E ; comp. the frequent phrase πάντῃ πάντως, Stallbaum, *ad Plat. Phaed.* p. 78 D). Should the apostle *in every case*, in which he adapted himself as described in vv. 19–22, save *some*,—that is, in the one case of accommodation *these*, in the other *those*, but in all *some*,—there would result the πλείονες of ver. 19, whom it was his design to win as there summarily set forth. — σώσω] make them partakers in the Messianic (salvation, vii. 16, x. 33 ; Rom. ix. 27, *al.* Not different in substance from κερδήσω, but stronger and more specific, as was suitable in expressing the *final result*. Comp. 1 Tim. iv. 16.

Ver. 23. Πάντα δὲ ποιῶ] quite general ; *now all that I do* is done for the gospel's sake. — ἵνα συγκοιν. αὐτοῦ γεν.] Epexegetis of διὰ τὸ εὐαγγ. : *in order that I may become a fellow-partaker therein*. (G¹) Comp. on συγκοιν., Rom. xi. 17. Whoever is included as belonging to those in whom the salvation proclaimed in the gospel shall be fulfilled (at the day of judgment), enters along with them when this fulfilment is accomplished into the participation of the gospel, to wit, through sharing in the common fruition of that which forms the *real contents* of the message of salvation. Hence the meaning in substance is : *in order to become one of those in whom the gospel will realize itself*, through their attaining the Messianic salvation. Note the *humility* of the expression ; he who laboured more than all others, has yet in view no higher reward for himself than just the salvation common to all believers. Flatt and Billroth make it : *in order to take part in the spreading of the gospel*. But the aim here stated corresponds to the βραβεῖον in ver. 24. The *inward* salvation of the *moral* life again (Semler and Pott) is only the ethical path of development, whereby men ultimately reach the συγκοινωνία here intended. Comp. Phil. iii. 10 ff.

Ver. 24 ff. Exhortation to his readers to follow his example, clothed in figures borrowed from the relations of athletic competition among the Greeks (comp. Phil. iii. 12 ff.).—Doubtless Paul, writing to the Corinthians, was thinking of the *Isthmian* games, which continued to be held even after the destruction of the city by Mummius (Pausanias, ii. 2). There is no sufficient ground for supposing the *Olympic* games to be meant, as those in which the foot-race formed a peculiarly prominent feature (Spanheim, Wolf, *al.*), for running was not excluded at the other places of competition ; and it is not necessary to assume that the apostle had a knowledge enabling him to make nice distinctions between the different kinds of contest at the different games. — τὸ βραβεῖον] λέγεται δὲ οὕτω τὸ διδόμενον γέρας τῷ νικήσαντι ἀθλητῇ, ἀπὸ μὲν τῶν διδόντων αὐτὸ βραβευτῶν βραβεῖον, ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν ἀθλούντων ἀθλον, Scholiast on Pindar, *Ol.* i. 5. Στέφος δὲ ἐστὶ τοῦ ἀγῶνος (the Isthmian) πίτυς (*pine*), τὸ δὲ ἀνέκαθεν σέλινα (not *ivy*, but *parsley*) καὶ αὐτοῦ ἦν στέφανος, Scholiast on Pindar, *Isthm.* ὑπόθεσις ; comp. Plutarch, *qu. symp.* v. 3, and see Boeckh and Dissen, *ad Pind. Ol.* xiii. 33 ; Hermann, *gottesdienstl. Alterth.* § 50. 27, ed. 2. In the *application* (ἵνα καταλ.), we are to understand the future *Messianic salvation* which all may reach. Comp. 1 Tim. vi. 12. — οὕτω τρέχετε, ἵνα] should not be rendered, as it is by most expositors, “so

run, that,”—which the *iva*, as a particle expressive of design, makes inadmissible (comp. vv. 26, 27),—but : *in such way run* (like the one referred to), *in order that*. This does away, too, with the awkwardness which would otherwise be involved in εἰς with the plural καταλάβητε. Paul exhorts his readers to run in a way as worthy of the prize (so to shape their inner and outer life), as the one who, by decision of the judge, receives the crown for the foot-race, in order that they may attain to it (*i.e.* the crown of the Messianic salvation). (H¹) There is no need for the arbitrary insertion of the idea : “*as is necessary*, in order that,” etc. (Hofmann).

Ver. 25. Δέ] marks the transition to the course of conduct observed by *any* competitor for a prize. — The emphasis is on πᾶς. It is from it that the conclusion is then drawn in ver. 26, ἐγὼ τοίνυν. — ὁ ἀγωνιζόμεν.] used as a substantive. The statement is as to what *every* competitor does to prepare himself for his struggle ; *in all respects he exercises self-control* (ἐγκρατ., see on vii. 9). The word ἀγωνίζεσθαι denotes every kind of competition, and includes therefore the more specific τρέχειν (comp. Herod. v. 22 ; Xen. *Anab.* iv. 8. 27 : ἀγωνίζεσθαι στάδιον). Regarding the *abstinence* (especially from wine, sexual intercourse, and all heavy food except a good flesh-diet), by which the competitors had to prepare themselves for the struggle for ten months previously, see Intpp. ad Hor. *Art. Poet.* 412 ff. ; Valckenaer, p. 251 ; Rosenmüller, *Morgenl.* VI. p. 97 f. ; Hermann, *gottesd. Alterth.* § 50. 16 f. — πάντα] Accusative of more precise definition. See Lobeck, *ad Aj.* 1402. Comp. ix. 25. — ἐκεῖνοι μὲν οὖν κ.τ.λ.] *illi quidem igitur*, to wit, the competitors proper. — ἡμεῖς] *we Christians*. The πάντα ἐγκρατεύεσθαι holds of *both* the ἀγωνιζόμενοι, only with the first it is in the sphere of the *body* ; with the second, in the *moral domain*. That the Christians, as striving in the moral field, actually πάντα ἐγκρατεύονται, is assumed by Paul, speaking from his ideal point of view, as a thing of course.

Vv. 26, 27. *So run I then*, seeing that I, for my part, according to ver. 25, am prepared by such abstinence to strive for the *incorruptible* crown, *in such a way as*, etc. The apostle thus sets his own ethical mode of striving (as a runner and combatant) before his readers as a pattern. Respecting the following τοίνυν, which Paul has only in this passage, comp. Luke xx. 25 ; Heb. xiii. 13 ; Hartung, *Partik.* II. p. 349 ; Baeumlein, *Partik.* p. 251 f. — οὐκ ἀδήλως] *sc. τρέχων*. The word means *unapparent, not clear*, reverse of πρόδηλος. It may either be applied *objectively* to an action which is indistinct and not cognizable to *others* (Luke xi. 44 ; 1 Cor. xiv. 8) ; or *subjectively*, so that the man who acts, hopes, etc., is *himself* not clear, but *uncertain* and *hesitating* as to manner, aim, and result ; comp. 2 Macc. vii. 34 ; 3 Macc. iv. 4 ; Thuc. i. 2. 1 ; Plato, *Symp.* p. 181 D ; Soph. *Trach.* 667 ; Dem. 416. 4 ; Polyb. xxx. 4. 17, viii. 3. 2, vi. 56. 11, iii. 54. 5 : ἀδήλος ἐπίβασις ; also in Xenoph., Plutarch, etc. So here ; and hence we should render : *not without a clearly conscious assurance and certainty of running so as to reach the goal*. Comp. Vulgate, “non in incertum ;” Chrysostom : πρὸς σκοπὸν τινὰ βλέπων, οὐκ εἰκῇ καὶ μάτην, Phil. iii. 14, κατὰ σκοπὸν διώκω ἐπὶ τὸ βραβεῖον, Bengel, “Scio quod petam et quomodo,” Melanchthon, “non coeco impetu sine cogitatione finis.” Hofmann takes it otherwise : “in whose case it is

quite apparent *whither he would go*," thus bringing out the *objective* sense ; comp. also Grotius. But this would convey too little, for as a matter of course it must be plain in the case of every runner in a race *whither he would go*. Homberg's rendering is better : "ut non in obscuro sim, sed potius inter reliquos emineam." Comp. Ewald : "not as in the dark, but as in the sight of all. Still this does not correspond so well with the parallel ὡς οὐκ ἄερα δέρων, which implies the conception of the *end* in view. Alex. Morus and Billroth (comp. Olshausen) understand it as meaning, *not without definite aim (not simply for private exercise)*. But this runs counter to the whole context, in which Paul is set forth as an *actual* runner in a race-course, so that the negative thus conveyed would be inappropriate. — οὐκ ἄερα δέρων] The boxer ought to strike his opponent, and not, missing him, to beat the *air*, to deal *strokes in air*. Comp. the German phrase, "*in's Blaue hinein*." See Eustath. *ad Il.* p. 663, 17, and the instances given by Wetstein. Comp. Theophilus, *ad Autol.* iii. 1. The context (see above on ἀδῆλ.) forbids us to render, with Theodoret, Calovius, Bengel, Zachariae, Billroth, Rückert, Olshausen, Hofmann, and others : *not in imaginary combat merely*, without a real antagonist (σκιαμαχία). Respecting the οὐκ in this passage, see Winer, p. 452 [E. T. 609]. — ἀλλ' ὑπωπιάζω κ.τ.λ.] *but I beat my body blue*,—alteration of the construction, in order to make the thought stand out in a more independent way ; comp. on vii. 37. The ἀλλά, however, can have the effect only of presenting what is here stated as the opposite of ἄερα δέρων, not as that whereby a man simply prepares himself for the contest (Hofmann, comp. Pott). Paul regards his own body (the σῶμα τῆς σαρκός, Col. ii. 11, the seat of the nature opposed to God, of the law in his members, comp. Rom. vi. 6, vii. 23) *as the adversary* (ἀνταγωνιστής), against whom he fights with an energetic and successful vehemence, just as a boxer beats the face of his opponent black and blue (respecting ὑπωπιάζειν, comp. on Luke xviii. 5, and Bos, *Exercitt.* p. 140 ff.), so that those lusts (Gal. v. 17), which war against the regenerate inner man, whose new principle of life is the Holy Spirit, lose their power and are not fulfilled. It is in substance the same thing as τὰς πράξεις τοῦ σώματος θανατοῦν in Rom. viii. 13 ; comp. Col. iii. 5. The result of the ὑπωπιάζω κ.τ.λ. is, that the body *becomes submissive* to the moral will,¹ yea, the members become weapons of righteousness (Rom. vi. 13). Hence Paul adds further : κ. δουλαγωγῶ, *I make it a slave* (Diodorus, xii. 24 ; Theophrastus, *Ep.* 36 ; Theophyl. Simoc. *Ep.* 4), which also "a pycetis desumptum est ; nam qui vicerat, victum trahebat adversarium quasi servum," Grotius. Against the abuse of this passage to favour ascetic scourgings of the body, see Deyling, *Obss.* I. p. 322 ff., ed. 3. — ἀλλοις κηρύξας] *after having been a herald to others*. The apostle still keeps to the same figure, comparing his preaching, in which he summoned and exhorted men to the Christian life, to the office of the *herald* who made known the laws of the games and called the champions to the combat. Rückert, who (with Chrysostom, Grotius, *al.*) regards κηρ. as denoting

¹ Comp. the weaker analogies in profane writers, as Xen. *Mem.* ii. 1. 28 ; Cicero, *Off.* i. 23. 79.

preaching without reference to the work of a herald, reminds us, in opposition to the above view (comp. de Wette), that the herald certainly did not himself join in the combat. But this objection does not hold, for *with Paul the case stood thus*: He, *in point of fact*, was a herald, who *joined personally in the contest*; and he had therefore to carry through his figure upon *this* footing, even although he thereby departed from the actually subsisting relations at the combats in the games.¹ — ἀδόκιμος] *rejectaneus, unapproved, i.e.* however, not “ne dignus quidem, qui ad certamen omnino admittar” (Pott), —for Paul is, from vv. 26, 27, actually in the midst of the contest, —but *praemio indignus*, —μη τοὺς ἄλλους τὸ δέον διδάξας αὐτὸς τοῦ τέλους τῶν ἀγώνων παντελῶς διαμάρτω, Theodoret. (1¹)

NOTES BY AMERICAN EDITOR.

(A¹) *Paul's defence.* Ver. 3.

The Revised Version very properly agrees with Meyer in his view of the connection, and puts a period at the end of ver. 3. Obviously what the Apostle was defending was the fact of his Apostleship, and not his claim to equal rights with the other apostles. All the recent critics unite in this view.

(B¹) “*Power to lead about a wife.*” Ver. 5.

Stanley says that two things are implied in this verse, viz. 1. That Paul was unmarried, which agrees with vii. 7; and 2. that the apostles generally were married, which agrees with the common tradition respecting all of them but John.

(C¹) “*Doth God care for oxen?*” Ver. 9.

The author's remarks on this vexed passage are weighty, and yet there seems room for further statement. Stanley says: “This is one of the many instances where the lesson which is regarded as subordinate is denied altogether, as in Hosea vi. 6, ‘I will have mercy and not sacrifice.’ God feeds the young ravens when they cry (Ps. cxlvii. 9), and the fowls of the air (Matt. vi. 26), and therefore Paul could not possibly intend to deny that the primary object of the precept was to secure just treatment for the laboring animal. What he means is that it had also a higher reference, viz., to teach the important truth that all labor should have its due compensation, and that they who by their toil obtain food for others ought themselves to share it.”

(D¹) *The sense of ἐξουσία.* Ver. 12.

In this verse is the fifth instance in the present chapter in which this word occurs. It is rendered in the common version *power*, for which Greeks usually employed another word (*dunamis*). The Revised Version in every case substitutes *right* (see vv. 4, 5, 6, 12), the sense being not physical, but moral authority.

¹ [Stanley remarks concerning this complication of the metaphor, that it is rendered less violent by the fact that the office of the herald itself was an object of competition,

and that sometimes, as in the case of Nero, the victor in the games was also selected as the herald to announce his success. — T. W. C.]

(E¹) *Paul's glorying.* Ver. 15.

Both the true reading and the correct rendering of this verse are violently disputed, but happily all agree as to its essential meaning, viz. that Paul would rather die than abandon what was the chief boast of his life. In the next verses he declares that the preaching of the Gospel is in itself no merit in him, but an irresistible necessity, a bounden duty. He is simply a servant doing what is commanded him (Luke xvii. 10), or a steward fulfilling his function (1 Cor. iv. i). Still, if he did the service willingly, voluntarily, and not merely out of a sense of obligation, he had a reward. Then in reply to the question, What is this reward? the answer is, "My reward is that I have no reward." To preach the Gospel without pay was what he coveted. To be permitted to serve others gratuitously was an honour and happiness.

(F¹) "*That I might gain the more.*" Ver. 19.

Canon Evans well says : "It is *the more* of comparison between a lesser number gained out of some classes, and a greater number gained out of all." He would have greater success through gratuitous preaching attracting all, than through paid preaching attracting some but repelling others.

(G¹) "*That I may become a fellow-partaker.*" Ver. 23.

A new thought is here introduced. Up to this point he had been speaking of his self-denial for the sake of others ; here he begins to speak of it for his own sake. It is no longer "that I may save some," but "that I may be partaker of the Gospel with you," i.e. as well as you. Do not think that I do not require this for myself. In order to do good, we must be good. To extend our Christian liberty to its utmost range is dangerous, not only for others but for ourselves. This argument is supported, first, by his own example (ix. 24-27); secondly, by the warning of the Israelitish history (x. 1-12) (Stanley).

(H¹) "*In such way run that ye may obtain.*" Ver. 24.

The application of the metaphor of the race to the progress of the Christian here occurs for the first time. Afterwards it is found in Philip. iii. 12, 14; 2 Tim. iv. 7, 8; Heb. xii. 1. The argument is, "It is not enough merely to run—all run; but as there is only one who is victorious, so you must run, not with the slowness of the many, but with the energy of the one." This imagery, as might be expected from discourses delivered in Palestine, never occurs in the Gospels (Stanley).

(I¹) "*Lest I myself should be rejected.*" Ver. 27.

What an argument and what a reproof is this! The reckless and listless Corinthians thought they could safely indulge themselves to the very verge of sin, while this devoted apostle considered himself as engaged in a life-struggle for his salvation. Yet at other times he breaks out in the most joyful assurance of salvation, and says that he was persuaded that nothing in heaven, earth, or hell could ever separate him from the love of God (Rom. viii. 38, 39). The one state of mind is the necessary condition of the other. It is only those who are conscious of this constant and deadly struggle with sin to whom this assurance is given. It is the indolent and self-indulgent Christian who is always in doubt (Hodge).

CHAPTER X.

Ver. 1. γάρ] Elz. has δέ, against decisive evidence. An alteration arising from failure to understand the connection. — Ver. 2. ἐβαπτίσαντο] A C D E F G $\aleph$ min. Dial. Bas. Cyr. *al.* have ἐβαπτίσθησαν. Recommended by Griesb., adopted by Lachm. and Rückert. It is, however, an alteration to which copyists were induced by being accustomed to the passive of βαπτ. ; the middle is sufficiently attested by B K L, Orig. Chrys. *al.* — Ver. 9. Κύριον] So B C $\aleph$, min. and several vss. and Fathers. The readings Θεόν and Χριστόν are interpretations, the first occurring in A, 2, Slav. ms. Bede, the second adopted by Elz. Scholz, and Tisch. on the authority of D E F G K L, min. vss. Fathers ; defended also by Reiche. Epiphanius avers Χριστόν to be a change made by Marcion. — Vv. 9, 10. Elz. adds καί after καθώς ; but this has too powerful testimony against it to be admissible on the ground of ver. 8. It is deleted by Lachm. Tisch. Rückert. — Ver. 9. ἀπώλοντο] Rückert, following A (?) B $\aleph$, reads ἀπώλλυντο, as he does also in ver. 10 on the authority of A. Rightly in both cases ; the change of tense was overlooked. — Ver. 11. πάντα] is wanting after δέ in A B 17, Sahid. and several Fathers. It comes before it in D E F G $\aleph$, 3, Aeth. and some Fathers. Bracketed by Lachm., deleted by Rück. and Tisch. ; an addition naturally suggested. — τύποι] Lachm. and Rück. read τυπικῶς, following A B C K $\aleph$, min. Syr. p. (on the margin), and many Fathers. Rightly ; the *Recepta*, defended by Reiche, is a repetition from ver. 6. As connected with τυπικῶς, however, and resting on very much the same attestation (including $\aleph$), συνέβαινεν should be adopted in place of συνέβαινον. — κατήντησεν] Lachm. and Tisch. have κατήντηκεν, on the authority of B D* E* F G $\aleph$, 39, 46, and some Fathers. An instance of the frequent transformation of the perfect into the aorist form, with which the transcribers were more familiar. — Ver. 13. Elz. has ὑμᾶς after δύνασθαι ; but this is an addition opposed by decisive evidence. — Ver. 19. Lachm. Rück. and Tisch. invert the order of the two questions, following B C** D E $\aleph$ ** , min. Copt. Sahid. Aeth. Vulg. Aug. Ambrosiast. Pel. Bede. Rightly. One of the two queries came to be left out, owing to the similarity in sound (so still in A C* and $\aleph$ *), and was afterwards restored where it seemed to stand most naturally (according to the order of origin and operation). Reiche, nevertheless, in his *Comm. crit.* I. p. 240 f., tries to defend the *Recepta* (K L, with most of the min. Syr. utr. Goth. and Greek Fathers). — Ver. 20. ἃ θέει τὰ ἔθνη] Lachm. Rück. and Tisch. read ἃ θύουσιν, on very preponderant evidence (as also θύουσιν afterwards). The missing subject τὰ ἔθνη was joined on to θύουσιν (so still in A C $\aleph$), which thereupon drew after it the change to θέει. — Ver. 23. Elz. has μοι after πάντα, against decisive evidence. Borrowed from vi. 12. — Ver. 24. After ἐτέρον Elz. has ἕκαστος, in face of decisive testimony. Supplied, perhaps, from remembrance of Phil. ii. 4. — Ver. 27. δέ] is wanting in A B D* F G $\aleph$, and some min. Copt. Vulg. Antioch. Chrys. Aug. Ambrosiast. Pel. *al.* Lachm. and Rück. are right in rejecting it as a mere connective addition. — Ver. 28. ἱερόθυτον] approved by Griesb., and adopted by Lachm. Rück. Tisch. Elz. and

Scholz. again have εἰδωλόθυτον, contrary to A B H 8, Sahid. and the indirect witnesses given by Tisch. The commoner word (which is defended by Reiche) was first written on the margin, and then taken into the text. — After συνείδησιν Elz. has τοῦ γὰρ Κυρίου ἡ γῆ κ. τὸ πλήρωμα αὐτῆς. A repetition of the clause in ver. 26, which crept from the margin into the text ; it is condemned by decisive testimony, as is also the δέ which Elz. puts after εἰ in ver. 30.

CONTENTS on to xi. 1.—The warnings supplied by the history of our fathers urge us to this self-conquest (vv. 1–11). Beware, therefore, of a fall ; the temptation has not yet gone beyond what you are able to bear, and God's faithfulness will not suffer it to do so in the future ; flee, then, from idolatry (vv. 12–14). This exhortation is supported, as regards the eating of sacrificial meat, by the analogies of the Lord's Supper and the Jewish usages in partaking of sacrifices (vv. 15–18). And therewith Paul returns from the long digression, which has occupied him since ix. 1, to his main subject, which he is now in a position to wind up and dispose of with all the more vigour and terseness (vv. 19–xi. 1).

Ver. 1. Γάρ] Paul had already, in ix. 26 f., set himself before his readers as an example of *self-conquest* ; he now *justifies* his special enforcement of this duty by the warning example of the fathers. Πλεῖον αὐτοὺς δεδιξασθαι βουληθεῖς τῶν κατὰ τὸν Ἰσραὴλ ἀναμνησκεί, καὶ ὅσων ἀπήλυσαν ἀγαθῶν καὶ ὅσαις περιέπεσαν τιμωρίαις. καὶ καλεῖ τύπους τούτων ἐκεῖνα, διδάσκων ὡς τὰ ὅμοια πείσονται τὴν ὁμοίαν ἀπιστίαν κτησάμενοι, Theodoret. — οὐ θέλω ὑμ. ἄγν.] indicating something of importance. See on Rom. xi. 25. — οἱ πατέρες ἡμ.] *i.e.* our forefathers at the time of the exodus from Egypt. The apostle says ἡμῶν, speaking, as in Rom. iv. 1, from his *national* consciousness, which was shared in by his Jewish readers, and well understood by his Gentile ones. The idea of the *spiritual* fatherhood of all *believers* (Rom. iv. 11 ff., de Wette, *al.*), or that of the O. T. ancestry of the N. T. church (Hofmann), would suit only with *holy* ancestors as being the *true* Israel (comp. Rom. ix. 5 ff. ; Gal. vi. 16), but does not harmonize with the fact of the fathers *here* referred to being cited as warnings. — πάντες] has strong emphasis,¹ and is four times repeated, the coming contrast of οὐκ ἐν τοῖς πλείοσιν, ver. 5, being already before the apostle's mind. *All* had the blessing of the divine presence (ὑπὸ τ. νεφ. ἦσαν), *all* that of the passage through the sea ; *all* received the analogue of baptism, *all* that of eating, *all* that of drinking at the Lord's Supper ; *but with the majority* God was *not* well pleased. — ὑπὸ τ. νεφ.] The well-known (τήν) pillar of cloud (Ex. xiii. 21 f.), in which God's presence was, is conceived as spreading its canopy over (ὑπό) the march of the people that followed it. Comp. Ps. cv. 39 ; Wisd. x. 17, xix. 7. — διὰ τῆς θαλάσσης.] See Ex. xiv.

Ver. 2. The discourse flows on in uninterrupted stream, beginning with the ὅτι in ver. 1, to the end of ver. 5 ; then follows the application in ver. 6. — εἰς τὸν Μωϋσῆν] *in reference to Moses*, so that they thereby devoted themselves to Moses as the deliverer and mediator whom God had sent them. Comp. on Rom. vi. 3 ; Matt. xxviii. 19. — ἐβαπτίσαντο] *they had*

¹ Grotius : “ tam qui sospites fuere, quam qui perierunt.”

themselves baptized, had the same thing, that is to say, done to them in reference to Moses as you had done to you in reference to Christ. The *middle*, which is not put here for the passive,—comp., on the contrary, what was said regarding ἀπελούσ., vi. 11,—is *purposely* chosen, as in Acts xxii. 16, to denote the *receptive* sense (see Kühner, II. p. 18; Valekenær, p. 256; Winer, p. 239 [E. T. 319]); for although ἐβαπτ., and the subsequent ἐφαγον and ἐπιον, do not represent any apparent *merit*, yet they certainly assume the *reception* of those wonderful divine manifestations, which nevertheless could not place the fathers, to whom such high privileges had been vouchsafed, in a position of safety afterwards, etc. — ἐν τῇ νεφ.] ἐν is *local*, as in βαπτίζειν ἐν ὕδατι, Matt. iii. 11, *al.*, indicating the *element in which*, by immersion and emergence, the baptism was effected. Just as the convert was baptized *in water* with reference to *Christ*, so also that O. T. analogue of baptism, which presents itself in the people of Israel at the passage of the Red Sea with reference to *Moses*, was effected in the *cloud* under which they were, and in the *sea* through which they passed. So far as the sacred *cloud*, familiar to the readers, is concerned, there is no need for the assumption, based somewhat uncertainly on Ps. lxviii. 9, of a “pluvia ex nube decidua” (Wolf, comp. Pott); neither, again, is it enough to define the point of comparison simply as Grotius does (comp. de Wette): “Nubes impendebat illorum capiti, sic et aqua iis, qui baptizantur; mare circumdabat eorum latera, sic et aqua eos, qui baptizantur.” The cloud and the sea, both being taken together as a type of the water of baptism, must be regarded as similar in *nature*. Comp. Pelagius: “Et *nubes* proprium *humo* rem portat;” so also Bengel: “Nubes et mare sunt naturae aqueae (quare etiam Paulus de columna ignis silet).” (J¹) Theodoret, on the other hand, with several more, among whom are Schrader, Olshausen, and Maier, makes the cloud a symbol of the *Spirit* (John iii. 5); but this would have against it the fact, that the baptism in the cloud (answering, according to this view, to the baptism of the Spirit) had *preceded* the baptism in the sea (water-baptism); so that we should have an incongruous representation of the baptism with water and the Holy Ghost. The cloud and the sea do not represent the *two* elements in baptism, the former the *heavenly*, and the latter the *earthly* one; but both together form the undivided type of baptism. The type appropriated the subjects to Moses as his; the antitype appropriates them to Christ as His redeemed ones; and in both instances this is done with a view to their salvation, as in the one case from temporal bondage and ruin, so in the other from that which is spiritual and eternal. We may add, that there is room enough for the play of typico-allegorical interpretation, to allow the circumstance to be kept out of account that the Israelites went *dry* through the sea (Ex. xiv. 16 ff.). The most arbitrary working out of the exposition of details may be seen in Theodoret.

Vv. 3, 4. Just as all received the self-same type of baptism (vv. 1, 2), so too all were partakers of one and the same analogue of the Christian ordinance of the Supper.¹—τὸ αὐτό] so that each one therefore stood on the very

¹ Bengel well says: “Si plura essent N. T. sacramenta, ceteris quoque simile quiddam

same level of apparent certainty of not being cast off by God. — The βρῶμα πνευματικόν is the *manna* (Ex. xvi. 13 ff.), inasmuch as it was not, like common food, a product of nature, but came as bread from heaven (Ps. lxxviii. 24 f.; Wisd. xvi. 20; John vi. 31 f.), the gift of God, who by His Spirit wrought marvellously for His people: Being vouchsafed by the χάρις πνευματική of Jehovah, it was, although material in itself, a χάρισμα πνευματικόν, a food of supernatural, divine, and spiritual origin. Comp. Theodore of Mopsuestia : πνευματικὸν καλεῖ καὶ τὸ βρῶμα καὶ τὸ πόμα, ὡς ἂν τοῦ πνεύματος ἁμῶν διὰ τοῦ Μωϋσέως κατὰ τὴν ἀπόρρητον αὐτοῦ παρασχόντος δύναμιν. οὕτω δὲ καὶ πνευματικὴν ἐκάλεσεν τὴν πέτραν, ὡς ἂν τῇ δυνάμει τοῦ πνεύματος ἐκδοῦσαν τὰ ὕδατα. What the Rabbins invented about the miraculous qualities of the manna may be seen in von der Hardt, *Ephem. phil.* pp. 101, 104; Eisenmenger's *entdeckt. Judenth.* II. p. 876 f., I. pp. 312, 467. Philo explains it as referring to the Logos, *Leg. alleg.* ii. p. 82, *Quod. deter. pot. insid. sol.* p. 213. — πόμα] Ex. xvii. 1–6; Num. xx. 2–11. Regarding the forms πόμα and πῶμα, see Lobeck, *Paral.* p. 425 f. — ἐπιον . . . Χριστός] a parenthetic explanation in detail as to the quite peculiar and marvellous character of this πόμα. The *imperfect* does not, like the preceding aorist, state the drinking absolutely as a historical fact, but is the *descriptive* imperfect, depicting the *process* of the ἐπιον according to the peculiar circumstances in which it took place; it thus has a *modal* force, showing *how* things *went on* with the πάντες . . . ἐπιον, while it was taking place. Bengel remarks rightly on the γάρ: “qualis petra, talis aqua.” — ἐκ πνευματ. ἀκολ. πέτρας ἡ δὲ πέτρα ἣν ὁ Χ.] *from a spiritual rock that followed them; the Rock, however* (which we speak of here), *was Christ.* Πνευματικῆς has the emphasis; it corresponds to the preceding πνευματικόν, and is explained more specifically by ἡ δὲ π. ἣν ὁ Χ. The relation denoted by ἀκολουθούσης, again, is assumed to be self-evident, and therefore no further explanation is given of the word. The thoughts, to which Paul here gives expression, are the following:—(1) To guard and help the Israelites in their journey through the wilderness, *Christ* accompanied them, namely, in His pre-existent divine nature, and consequently as the Son of God (= the Λόγος of John), who afterwards appeared as man (comp. Wisd. x. 15 ff.). (2) The *rock*, from which the water that they drank flowed, was not an ordinary natural rock, but a πέτρα πνευματική; not the mere appearance or phantasm of a rock, but an actual one, although of supernatural and heavenly origin, inasmuch as it was *the real self-revelation and manifestation* of the Son of God, who invisibly accompanied the host on its march; it was, in other words, the *very Christ* from heaven, as being His own substantial and efficient presentation of Himself to men (comp. Targ. Isa. xvi. 1, and Philo's view, p. 1103 A, that the rock was the σοφία). (3) Such being the state of the case as to the rock, it must of necessity be a rock that *followed*, that *accompanied* and *went with* the children of Israel in

posuisset Paulus.” At the same time, it should be observed that the ecclesiastical notion of a sacrament does not appear in the N. T., but is an abstraction from the common characteristics of the two ordi-

nances in question. Both, however, are equally essential and characteristic elements in the fellowship of the Christian life. Comp. Baur, *neut. Theol.* p. 200; Weiss, *bibl. Theol.* p. 353.

their way through the desert ; for Christ in His pre-existent condition, the heavenly "substratum," so to speak, of this rock, went constantly with them, so that everywhere in the wilderness His essential presence could manifest itself in their actual experience through the rock with its abundant water ; and, in point of fact, did so manifest itself again and again. In drinking from the *rock*, they had their thirst quenched by *Christ*, who, making the rock His form of manifestation, supplied the water *from Himself*, although *this* marvellous speciality about the way in which their thirst was met remained hidden from the Israelites. — Since the apostle's words thus clearly and completely explain themselves, we have no right to ascribe to Paul, what was a later invention of the Rabbins, the notion that *the rock rolled along after the marching host* (*Bammidbar*, *R. S.* 1 ; Onkelos on Num. xxi. 18–20 ; and see Wetstein and Schöttgen, also Lund, *Heiligth.*, ed. Wolf, p. 251) ; such fictions as these, when compared with what the apostle actually says, should certainly be regarded as extravagant after-growths (in opposition to Rückert and de Wette). It is just as unwarrantable, however, to explain away, by any exegetical expedient, this rock which followed them, and which was Christ. The attempts which have been made with this view run directly counter to the plain meaning of the words ; *e.g.* the interpretation of Erasmus, Beza, Calvin, Piscator, Drusius, Grotius, Lightfoot, Billroth, *al.* (which dates from Theodore of Mopsuestia), that the rock means here what came from it, *the water* (!), which, they hold, followed the people and *prefigured* Christ (ἦν). That ἦν denotes here *significabat* (so too Augustine, Vatablus, Salmasius, Bengel, Loesner, *al.*), is a purely arbitrary assumption, seeing that Paul neither *says* ἐστίν, nor τύπος ἦν, or the like, nor even *indicates* in any way in the context a typico-allegorical reference. This applies also against what Ch. F. Fritzsche has in his *Nova Opusc.* p. 261 : "The rock in the wilderness was a rock of blessing, strength, and life-giving for the Jews, and thus it *prefigures* Christ," etc. Paul does not say anything of the sort ; it is simply his expositors who insert it on their own authority. Baur, too, does violence to the apostle's words (comp. his *neut. Theol.* p. 193), by asserting that Paul speaks of Christ as the πνευμ. πέτρα only in so far as he saw a *type* which had reference to Christ in the rock that followed the Israelites, according to the allegoric interpretation which he put upon it.¹ See, in opposition to this, Rübiger, *Christol. Paul.* p. 31 f. ; Weiss, *bibl. Theol.* p. 319. The *ordinary* exposition comes nearer to the truth, but fails to reach it in this respect, that it does not keep firm enough hold of the statement, that "*that rock was Christ*," and so of its *identity* with Him, but takes Christ to be the Rock only in an ideal and figurative sense, regarding Him as different from the rock from which the water flowed, but as the author of its supply. So, in substance, Chrysostom,² Oecumenius, Theophylact, Melancthon, Cornelius à Lapide, and many others, among

¹ Baur is wholly unwarranted in taking πνευματικός, ver. 3 f., in the sense of *typical* or *allegorically significant*. His appeal to Rev. xi. 8 and Barnab. 10 is irrelevant.

² οὐ γὰρ ἡ τῆς πέτρας φύσις τὸ ὕδωρ ἡφίει

φησιν οὐ γὰρ ἂν καὶ πρὸ τούτου ἀνέβλυζεν, ἀλλ' ἐτέρα τις πέτρα πνευματικὴ τὸ πᾶν εἰργάζετο, τούτέστιν ὁ Χριστὸς ὁ παρὼν αὐτοῖς πανταχοῦ καὶ πάντα θαυματοργῶν.

whom are Flatt, Kling in the *Stud. und Krit.* 1839, p. 835 ; Osiander, Neander, Hofmann.¹ (κ¹)

Ver. 5. Ὀὐκ ἐν τοῖς πλείοσιν] *not with the greater part of them.* A tragical *litotes*. Caleb and Joshua alone reached the land of promise. Num. xiv. 30. — κατεστρώθησαν] *were struck down.*² Comp. Num. xiv. 16, 29. Their dying in the wilderness (some by a violent, some by a natural death) is here vividly portrayed, in accordance with Num. xiv., as death by the hand of God (Herod. viii. 53, ix. 76 ; Xen. *Cyr.* iii. 3. 64 ; Judith vii. 14 ; 2 Macc. v. 26). Comp. also Heb. iii. 17.

Ver. 6. The typical reference of what is adduced in vv. 1–5 to the Christians : *These things* (while they so fell out) *became types of us*, *i.e.* historical transactions of the O. T., guided and shaped by God, and designed by Him figuratively to represent the corresponding relation and experience on the part of Christians. See regarding τύπος, on Rom. v. 14. — ἐγενήθησαν] The *plural* is by attraction from the predicate τύποι. See Kühner, II. p. 53 f. ; Krüger, § lxiii. 6. Hofmann (comp. vi. 11) takes the Israelites as the subject : “ *They became this as types of us ;*” but the recurrence of the ταῦτα in ver. 11 should have been enough of itself to preclude such a view. — ἐπιθυμητ. κακῶν] quite general in its reference : *desirers* (Herod. vii. 6 ; Dem. 661 *ult.*, and often in Plato) *of evil things* (Rom. i. 30). To restrict it to the “ *Corinthios epulatores*” (Grotius) is arbitrary ; for it is equally so to confine the καθὼς κακεῖνοι ἐπεθ. which follows solely (Rückert, de Wette, Osiander, Neander), or particularly (Hofmann), to the desire of the Israelites *for flesh* (Num. xi. 4), whereas in truth the words refer generally to the evil lusts which they manifested so often and in so many ways upon their journey, that particular desire not excluded.

Ver. 7. There follows now upon this *general* warning the first of four *special* ones against sins, to which the ἐπιθυμεῖν κακῶν might very easily lead. “ *Eligit, quod maxime Corinthiis congruebat,*” Calvin. — μηδέ] *also* in particular *do not*. Comp. Buttmann, *neut. Gr.* p. 314 [E. T. 366]. The repetitions of μηδέ which follow, too, from ver. 8 to ver. 10 are *also* negatived, but in continuance of the special prohibitions. — γίνεσθε] in the second per-

¹ Comp. his *Schriftbew.* I. p. 171: “ The rock from which the water flowed was a natural one, and stood fast in its own place ; but the true Rock that really gave the water was the יְהוָה צוּר (Isa. xxx. 29), was *Jehovah*, who went with Israel.” By not calling the Rock *God*, but *Christ*, the apostle points forward, as it were (according to Hofmann), to the application which he is about to make of the words, namely, to the cup which Christ gives us to drink. But Paul’s words are so simple, clear, and definite, that it is impossible to get off by any *quid pro quo*. For the rest, it is to be observed that in this passage, as in the previous one, where the crossing of the sea is taken as a typical prefiguration of baptism, we have doubtless a *Rabbinical* pro-

cess of thought on the part of the apostle, which, as such, is not to be measured by the taste of our day, so that this unvarnished exegetical conception of it might be set down as something “ *absurd*,” as is done by Hofmann. The Rabbinical culture of his time, under which the apostle grew up, was not done away with by the fact of his becoming the vessel of divine grace, revelation, and power. Comp. Gal. iv. 22 ff. Our passage has nothing whatever to do with Isa. xxx. 29, where men go up into the temple to Jehovah, the Rock of Israel. It is of importance, however, in connection with Paul’s doctrine regarding the pre-existence of Christ and its accordance with the doctrine of the Logos.

² [Literally, *strewn* as corpses.—T. W. C.]

son, because of the *special* danger to which his readers, *from their circumstances*, were exposed. Comp. on ver. 10. — εἰδωλολάτραι] What Paul means is the *indirect* idolatry involved in partaking of the heathen sacrificial feasts. Comp. on v. 11. This is clear from the quotation which he goes on to make (φαγεῖν κ. πιεῖν). Comp. vv. 14, 20, 21. The passage cited is Ex. xxxii. 6 according to the LXX.; it describes the sacrificial feast after the sacrifice offered to the golden calf. The τινὲς αὐτῶν, four times repeated, *certain of them*, notwithstanding there were very many (although not all), brings out all the more forcibly the offences over-against the greatness of the penal judgments. Comp. on Rom. iii. 3. — παίζειν] *to be merry*. This comprised *dancing*, as we may gather from Ex. xxxii. 19, and from ancient customs generally at sacrificial feasts; but to make this the thing specially referred to here (Hom. *Od.* viii. 251; Hesiod, *Scut.* 277; Pindar, *Ol.* xiii. 123) does not harmonize with the more general meaning of קָצַף in the original text. To understand the phrase as indicating *unchastity* (Tertull. *de jejun.* 6) is contrary to Ex. xxxii. 18, 19, and Philo, *de vit. Mos.* 3, pp. 677 D, 694 A.

Ver. 8. Ἐπόρνευσαν] Num. xxv. 1 ff. — εἰκοσι τρεῖς] According to Num. xxv. 9, there were 24,000. So too Philo, *de vit. Mos.* 1, p. 694 A; *de fortit.* p. 742 D; and the Rabbins in Lightfoot, *Horae*, p. 205; also Josephus, *Antt.* iv. 6. 12. A *slip of memory* on the apostle's part, (L¹) as might easily take place, so that there is no need of supposing a variation in the tradition (Bengel, Pott), or an error in his copy of the LXX. (Ewald). Among the arbitrary attempts at reconciliation which have been made are the following: that Paul narrates only what happened on one day, Moses what happened on two (Grotius); that Moses gives the maximum, Paul the minimum (Calvin, Bengel); that 23,000 fell *vi divina*; and 1000 *gladio zelotarum* (Krebs, after Bernard and Havercamp on Josephus, *loc. cit.*); that Paul states merely what befell the tribe at Simeon (Michaelis). Cajetan and Surenhusius would have us read εἰκοσι τέσσαρες, as, in point of fact, is given in a few codd., but manifestly by way of correction. Osiander too leans to this; comp. Valckenaer.

Ver. 9. Ἐκπειρ.] Stronger than the simple verb (*to prove to the full*), Matt. iv. 7; Luke x. 25. Comp. the classic ἐκπειράομαι (Herod. iii. 135; Plat. *ep.* 13, p. 362 E). *To try the Lord*,¹ נִסָּה אֶת-יְהוָה, means generally, *to let it come to the point whether He will show Himself to be God*; in this case: *whether He will punish* (“quousque itura sit ejus patientia,” Grotius). See in general, Wetstein, *ad Matt.* iv. 7. What special kind of trying Paul has here in view, appears from καθὼς κ.τ.λ., where the reference is to the people after their deliverance *losing heart* over the contrast between their position in the wilderness and the pleasures of Egypt. See Num. xxi. 4–6. The readers therefore could not fail to understand that what the apostle meant was *discontent* on their part with their present *Christian* position, as involving so much renunciation of sensual pleasures formerly indulged in. How

¹ The Κύριος is *God* in Num. xxi. 4 ff. Paul's readers, whose familiarity with the history in question is taken for granted,

had no reason to refer it to *Christ* as the λόγος ἁσαρκος (from which comes the *Recepta Χριστόν*).

many, forgetting the blessings of their spiritual deliverance, might look back with a discontented longing to the license of the past! It is a common opinion that Paul designates their *participation in the sacrificial feasts* as a tempting of God (comp. ver. 22, where, however, the connection is totally different, and τὸν κύριον does not apply to God at all). So Billroth, Rückert, de Wette, Osiander, Maier; but this is quite at variance with the context, because not in keeping with the historical events indicated by the καθὼς καὶ κ.τ.λ., and familiar to the readers. The context equally forbids the interpretations of Chrysostom and Theophylact: the *craving for wonders*; Theodoret, the *speaking with tongues*; Grotius, the conduct of the *schismatics*; and Michaelis, that of the *anti-Pauline party*. — ἐπείρασεν] namely, αὐτόν, not in an absolute sense (Winer, Reiche). — ἀπώλλυντο] see the critical remarks. The *imperfect* lays the stress on the *continuous* development of what occurred, and thus places it in the foreground of the historic picture. See Kühner, II. p. 74. As to ὑπό with ἀπώλλ., see Valckenauer, p. 261. Ellendt, *Lex. Soph.* II. p. 880.

Ver. 10. *Nor murmur*, etc.; expression of *contumacious discontent* (Matt. xx. 11; Phil. ii. 14), without right of reason. *Against whom?* is discovered from the *narrative*, to which Paul here refers us. That this is to be found not in Num. xiv. (the more common view), but in Num. xvi. 41, 49 (Calvin, de Wette, Osiander, Neander, Maier, Ewald), is clear, in the first place, because ἀπώλλ. ὑπὸ τ. ὀλοθρ. denotes a *violent* death, which does not tally with Num. xiv.; and, in the second, because τινὲς αὐτῶν cannot apply to the whole people (except Caleb and Joshua), which it would have to do according to Num. xiv. If, however, what Paul has here in view is the murmuring against *Moses and Aaron* after the death of Korah and his company (Num. xvi. 41, 49), then his prohibition must refer not to discontent *against God* (which was, moreover, referred to already in ver. 9), but only to murmuring *against the divinely commissioned teachers* (Paul, Apollos, and others), who, in their position and authoritative exercise of discipline, corresponded to the type of Moses and Aaron as the theocratic leaders and teachers of the rebellious people. And it is for this reason that he uses the *second* person here, although the first both precedes and follows it. Amidst the self-conceit and frivolity which were so rife at Corinth, and under the influences of the party-spirit that prevailed, there could not fail to be perverse dispositions of the kind indicated, which would find abundant expression. Comp. the evils prevalent in the same community at a later date, against which Clement contends in his epistle. — ἀπώλλ. ὑπὸ τ. ὀλοθρ.] namely, the 14,700, whose destruction (Num. xvi. 46 ff.) is ascribed to the *plague* (פִּגְמָה) of God. Paul defines this more closely as wrought by the *Destroyer* (Hesychius, λυμεών), who is the executor of the divine plague, just as in Ex. xii. 23 the מַשְׁחִית executes the plague (פִּגְמָה) of God,—this *personal* rendering of מַשְׁחִית (according to others, *pernicies*), which was the traditional one from the earliest times among Jews and Christians alike, being followed by the apostle also. The ὀλοθρευτής (ὁ ὀλοθρεύων, Ex. xii. 23; Heb. xi. 28; Wisd. xviii. 25. Comp. 2 Sam. xxiv. 16; Isa. xxxvii. 36; Job xxxiii. 22, *al.*; Acts xii. 23) is the *angel* commissioned by God to carry out the slaughter; and he

again is neither to be conceived of as an *evil* angel (a conception still foreign to the *old* Hebrew theology in general ; see also 1 Chron. xxi. 12 ; 2 Chron. xxxii. 21 ; 2 Macc. xv. 22, 23), nor rationalized into a pestilence. The Rabbinical doctrine of the כְּלֵאֵךְ הַמּוֹת (see Eisenmenger, *entdecktes Judenth.* I. p. 854 ff.) developed itself out of the Hebrew idea. — Ὁλοθρεύω, and the words formed from it, belong to the Alexandrian Greek. See Bleek on *Heb.* II. p. 809. But the reading ὀλεθρ., although in itself more correct, is very weakly attested here.

Ver. 11. Ταῦτα] These facts, referred to in ver. 6 ff. — τυπικῶς] in a *typical fashion*,¹ in such a way that, as they fell out, a typical character, a predictive reference, impressed itself upon them. Eisenmenger (II. p. 159 f., 264, 801) gives passages from the Rabbins in support of the principle of the interconnection of the whole theocratic history : “ Quicquid evenit patribus, signum filiis,”—a principle generally correct according to the idea of the θεῖα μοῖρα. It is only among the Fathers that we find τυπικός and τυπικῶς used anywhere else in this sense (it is otherwise in Plutarch, *Mor.* p. 442 C). — συνέβαινον] brings out the *progressive development* of the events ; the aorist ἐγράφη simply *states* the fact.² Comp. on ver. 4, and Matthiae, p. 1117. The δέ contrasts ἐγράφη κ.τ.λ. with what precedes it, expressing “ quod novum quid accedit, oppositionem quandam,” Hermann, *ad Viger.* p. 845 : “ that it was *written*, again, was for,” etc. — πρὸς νουθεσίαν ἡμῶν] *for our admonition* (comp. on iv. 14). That is to say, when we are tempted to the same sins, then should the thought of those facts that happened τυπικῶς, warn us not to bring down upon ourselves like judgments by like offences. As to the later form, νουθεσία in place of νουθέτησις and νουθετία, see Lobeck, *ad Phryn.* p. 512. — εἰς οὗς κ.τ.λ.] is not opposed, as Hofmann would have it, to the *beginning* of Israel's history, to which the transactions in question belong, which is neither conveyed by the text nor in itself historically correct (for the beginning of that history lies in the days of the patriarchs) ; but it *gives point* to the warning by reminding the readers how *nigh at hand the day was of retributive decision*. Τὰ τέλη τῶν αἰώνων is identical with ἡ συντέλεια τῶν αἰώνων, Heb. ix. 26, the concrete τὰ τέλη (the ends) being put here for the abstract συντέλεια (consummation). In other words, upon the supposition of the Parousia being close at hand, the last times of the world were now come ; the αἰῶνες, which had their commencement at its beginning, were now *running out their final course*. The *plural* expression τὰ τέλη, here used, corresponds to the conception of a *plurality* of periods in the world's history, whose common consummation should carry with it *the final issues of them all*.³ With the Parousia the αἰῶνες ἐπερχόμενοι (see on

¹ The *Recepta* τύποι would mean : These things happened to them *as types* ; comp. ver. 6. Hofmann takes ταῦτα δὲ τύποι as an independent clause. But what an arbitrary disruption of the sentence this would be ! And how thoroughly self-evident and void of significance the συνέβαινον ἐκείνοις would in that case be !

² [The former verb (plural) relates to the

events in *detail* ; the latter (singular) to the record as a *whole*.—T. W. C.]

³ Weiss, in his *bibl. Theol.* p. 301, gives a different interpretation, making τὰ τέλη the *goals*. Each of the past αἰῶνες, according to his view, served as a preparation for the time of full maturity. But Paul always uses τέλος in the sense of *end* (in 1 Tim. i. 5 it is otherwise) ; and this, too, is the most natural

Eph. ii. 7) begin to run. What is implied by the *plural* is not *one thing running alongside of another*, in particular, not the time of Israel and the time of the Gentiles (Hofmann), but the *succession* of the world-periods, one *coming after* another. So always, where *αἰῶνες* occurs in a temporal sense. — *κατήντηκεν*] *They have reached to us, i.e. have fallen upon our lifetime, and are now here.* The *αἰῶνες* are conceived of as stretching themselves out, as it were, in space. Comp. xiv. 36.

Ver. 12. *Ὡστε*] *Wherefore*, warned by these instances from the O. T. — *ἑστάναι*] *whosoever thinks that he stands, i.e. is firm and secure* (Rom. v. 2, and comp. on 1 Cor. xv. 1) in the Christian life, namely, in strength of faith, virtue, etc. Comp. Rom. xiv. 4. — *βλεπέτω, μὴ πέσῃ*] points to the *moral* fall, whereby a man comes to live and act in an unchristian way. The greater, in any case, the self-confidence, the greater the danger of such a fall. And how much must the moral illusions abroad at Corinth have made this warning needful! Others understand the continuance in, or falling from, *a state of grace* to be meant (see Calvin, Bengel, Osiander). But all the admonitions, from ver. 6 onwards (see, too, ver. 14), have a direct reference to falling *into sins*, the *consequence* of which is a falling from grace so as to come under the divine *ὀργή* (comp. Gal. v. 4).

Ver. 13. Encouragement to this *βλεπέτω μὴ πέσῃ*. “Your temptations, as you know, have not hitherto gone beyond your strength, neither will they, through the faithfulness of God, do so in the future.” Rückert follows Chrysostom, Theodoret, Theophylact, Grotius, Bengel, Zachariae, and others, in his interpretation: “You are not yet out of danger; the temptations which have hitherto assailed you were only human ones, and you have not withstood them over-well (?); there may come others greater and more grievous.” Similarly Olshausen, de Wette, Osiander, Neander, Ewald; so that, according to this view, Paul seeks first of all to humble, and then, from *πιστός* onwards, to encourage,—a connecting thought, however, *being interpolated* between the two clauses (“sed nunc major tentatio imminet,” Bengel). — *πειρασμός*] The context makes no special mention of *sufferings and persecutions* (Chrysostom, Theodoret, Camerarius, Grotius, Ewald, *al.*), but of *incitements to sin* in general, as things which, if not overcome, instead of being a discipline to the man exposed to them, will bring about his *πίπτειν*; but suffering is *included* among the rest in virtue of the moral dangers which it involves. Pott restricts the reference too much (comp. also Hofmann): “tentatio quae per invitationem ad convivia illa vobis accidit,” which is inadmissible in view of the general terms employed in ver. 12; the particular application follows only in ver. 14. — *εἰληφεν*] marks the continuance of the fact of its not having taken them. It has not done so, and does not now. This use of *λαμβάνειν*, in reference to fortunes, states, etc., which *seize upon* men, is very common in the classics (Thuc. ii. 42; Pind. *Ol.* i. 130; Xen. *Symp.* i. 15, and often in Homer). Comp. Luke v. 26, vii. 16; Wisd. xi. 12; Bar. vi. 5. — *ἀνθρώπινος*] *i.e. viribus humanis accommodatus, οὐχ ὑπὲρ δ*

meaning here, where he is speaking of the lapse of periods of time. The thought is

the same as in *πλήρωμα τῶν καιρῶν*, Eph. i. 9 f.

δύναται ἄνθρωπος. See Pollux, iii. 131. The fact that in the second clause of the verse this phrase has ὑπὲρ δὲ δύνασθε and τοῦ δύνασθαι ὑπενεγκεῖν corresponding to it, militates against the rendering: “*not of superhuman origin*” (comp. Plato, *Alc.* i. p. 103 A; *Phaedr.* p. 259 D; *Rep.* p. 497 C, 492 E), *i.e.* either not *from the devil* (Melanchthon, Piscator, Vorstius, *al.*), or not *from God* (Olshausen, who finds an allusion in the second clause to the *dolores Messiae*). Comp. οὐκ ἀνθρωπίνη κακία, Polyb. i. 67. 6, and the like; Plato, *Prot.* p. 344 C, *Crat.* p. 438 C; οὐκ ἀνθρωπίνης δυνάμεως, Thuc. vi. 78. 2; ὅσα ἄνθρωποι (*sc.* *δύνανται*), Plato, *Rep.* p. 467 C; μεῖζον ἢ κατ’ ἄνθρωπον, Soph. *Oed. Col.* 604. Chrysostom: ἀνθρώπινος, ταυτέστι μικρὸς, βραχὺς, σύμμετρος. — πιστός] for if He allowed them to be tempted beyond their powers, He would then be *unfaithful* to them as regards His having called them to the Messianic salvation, which now, in the case supposed, it would be impossible for them to reach. (M¹)—ὅς] in the sense of ὅτι οὗτος, like the German “*er* der.” Comp. Bernhardt, p. 291. “Ὅσγε would be still more emphatic. — δὲ δύνασθε] *what you are in a position to bear*. The context shows the more special meaning. Comp. on iii. 2. — ἀλλὰ ποιήσει κ.τ.λ.] *but will with the* (then existing) *temptation make also the issue, i.e.* not the one without the other. God is therefore conceived of *here* as He who *makes* the temptation, *i.e.* brings about the circumstances and situations which give rise to it (comp. on Matt. vi. 13), but, *previously*, as He who *lets* men be tempted. The two things, according to Paul’s view of the divine agency in the world, are in substance the same; the God who allows the thing to be is He also who brings it to pass. Hence the two modes of conception may be used interchangeably, as here, without contradiction. — Comp. on Rom. i. 24. — τ. ἐκβασιν] the *issue* (*egressum*, Wisd. ii. 17, viii. 9, xi. 16; Hom. *Od.* v. 410; Xen. *Anab.* iv. 1. 20, iv. 2. 1; Polyb. iv. 64. 5) from the temptation, so that one escapes out of it morally free (comp. ἐκ πειρασμοῦ ῥύεσθαι, 2 Pet. ii. 9); similarly Eur. *Med.* 279, ἐκβασις ἄτης. Theophylact gives the sense with substantial correctness, τὴν ἀπαλλαγὴν τοῦ πειρασμοῦ; but it is unsuitable to make, as he does, the σὺν κ.τ.λ. refer to *coincidence in time* (ἅμα τῷ ἐπελθεῖν ὑμῖν τὸν πειρασμόν); so also Hofmann. Bengel puts it well: “*καί, etiam, indivulso nexu.*” — τοῦ δύνασθαι ὑπεν.] does not say wherein the issue might consist (*of being able to bear the temptation*; comp. Fritzsche, *ad Matth.* p. 844), for the δύνασθαι ὑπεν. is no ἐκβασις (the taking it so is *illogical*); but it is the *genitive of design*: *in order that you may be able to bear it* (the temptation). Were it not that God gave the ἐκβασις along with the πειρασμός, the latter would be too heavy for you; you would not be able to bear up under it, but would be crushed altogether. But that is not His *will*. That ὑμᾶς should be supplied to δύν. ὑπεν., is clear of itself from what precedes. See Kühner, *ad Xen. Mem.* iii. 6. 10.

Ver. 14. Διόπερ] *for this very reason* (viii. 13), to wit, in order that you may not withdraw from this saving guidance of the faithful God, and deprive yourselves of it; idolatry would *separate you from God*. Comp. ver. 22. And they would make themselves indirectly guilty of idolatry *by partaking of the sacrificial feasts*. See vv. 7, 20 f. As respects φεύγειν ἀπό, *fugiendo discedere a*, see on Matt. iii. 7. Rückert would draw a distinction

here to the effect that, had the verb been joined with the *accusative* (vi. 18), it would have indicated that the readers were *already involved* in idolatrous worship ; but this is untenable (2 Tim. ii. 22 ; Wisd. i. 5 ; Plato, *Legg.* i. p. 636 E ; Soph. *Phil.* 637, *Oed. R.* 355), being a confusion of the phrase in question with *φεύγειν ἐκ* (Xen. *Anab.* i. 2. 18 ; Tob. i. 18). The precise meaning here must be sought in the *context*, which certainly gives us only the idea of the danger being at hand (ver. 7).

Ver. 15 ff. Paul has just been forbidding his readers to participate in the sacrificial feasts, *on the ground of its being idolatry*. This he now explains by the analogy of the holy fellowship, into which the Lord's Supper (vv. 15–17), and participation in the Israelitish sacrifices (ver. 18), respectively brought those who partook of them. It does not follow from his second illustration that the idols were gods, but that they were demons, with whom his readers should have no fellowship ; one could not partake both of Christ's table and of the table of demons (vv. 19–22). The former excludes the latter.

Ver. 15. Ὡς φρονίμοις] *i.e.* to those of whom I take for granted that they are intelligent ; ὥς indicates the *mode of contemplation*, the aspect under which he regards his readers in saying to them, etc. Comp. iii. 1 ; 2 Cor. vi. 13, *al.* See Bernhardt, p. 333. — λέγω refers to κρίνατε ὑμ. ὁ φ. (comp. vii. 12), and ὁ φημι points to what follows in vv. 16–18. “*As to intelligent men (who can judge aright), I say : judge ye what I affirm.*” On the difference between λέγω and φημί, comp. Rom. iii. 8 ; Herod. iii. 35 ; Xen. *Apol.* 13, *Anab.* i. 7. 18, vi. 6. 16, ii. 1. 14 ; Ellendt, *Lex. Soph.* II. p. 906. — The emphasis is on ὑμεῖς ; your own judgment shall decide.

Ver. 16. Τὸ ποτήριον] It is most natural to take this as in the *accusative*, after the analogy of the second clause of the verse (against Rückert). Respecting the *attractio inversa*, as in Matt. xxi. 42, see Bornemann, *Schol. in Luc.* p. 16 f. ; Buttman, *neut. Gr.* p. 247 [E. T. 288] ; Kühner, II. p. 512. This Greek fashion of “*trajection*” is of such common occurrence, that it is a piece of pure arbitrariness to infer, with Hofmann, from the *accusative* here that the *action* of blessing and breaking, of which the elements are the objects, *makes* them the *κοινωνία*. — Paul names the *cup first*, not because at the sacrificial feasts men thought less about food than about a pleasant meeting primarily for enjoying wine (they came for eating and drinking), but because he means to speak at more length about the bread, and in connection with it, especially to discuss the Israelitic partaking of the sacrifices, *as it suited his theme of the meat offered to idols*. For this reason he begins here by disposing briefly of the point concerning the cup. In chap. xi. he does otherwise, because not regarding the matter there from this special point of view. — τῆς εὐλογίας] *genit. qualit.*, *i.e.* the cup over which the blessing is spoken, namely, when the wine contained in it is expressly consecrated by prayer to the sacred use of the Lord's Supper.¹ It

¹ Who had to officiate at this consecration ? Every Christian man probably might do so at that time, when the arrangements of church-life as regards public worship were as yet so little reduced to fixed order. In

Justin Martyr's time (*Apol.* i. 65) it fell to the προεστώς, but so that the president is conceived as representing and acting in fellowship with the congregation. See Ritschl, *altkathol. K.* p. 365 f. The *plurals* in the pas-

is a mistake to understand τῆς εὐλογ. actively : *the cup which brings blessing* (Flatt, Olshausen, Kling), as the more detailed explanations which follow are sufficient of themselves to prove. They equally forbid the explanation of Schulz : *the cup of praise*¹ (comp. Kahnis, *Lehre vom Abendm.* p. 128). Neither should the phrase be viewed as a *terminus technicus* borrowed from the Jewish liturgy, and answering to the כּוּם הברכה. See on Matt. xxvi. 27, and Rückert, *Abendm.* p. 219 f. — δ εὐλογοῦμεν] an epexegetis giving additional solemnity to the statement : *which we bless, consecrate with prayer, when we celebrate the Lord's Supper.* Comp. Mark viii. 7 ; Luke ix. 16 ; 1 Sam. ix. 13. Εὐλογ. in its literal sense must not be confounded with εὐχαριστ. (Erasmus, Zwingli, Melanchthon, Beza : “quod cum gratiarum actione sumimus”), although the prayer *was*, in point of fact, a thanksgiving prayer in accordance with Christ's example, xi. 24 f. As to the difference between the two words, comp. on xiv. 16. — οὐχὶ κοιν. τ. αἵμ. τ. Χ. ἐστι] This is aptly explained by Grotius (after Melanchthon and others) : “κοινωνίαν vocat id, per quod fit ipsa communio.” The cup, *i.e.* its contents as these are presented and partaken of, is the *medium* of this fellowship ; it is *realized* in the partaking.² Comp. i. 30 ; John xii. 25, xvii. 3 ; Rodatz in Rudelbach's *Zeitschrift*, 1844, 1, p. 131 ; Fritzsche, *ad Rom.* II. p. 31. The sense therefore is : *Is not communion with the blood of Christ established through partaking of the cup ?*³ Ἔστι never means anything else than *est* (never *significat*) ; it is the copula of *existence* ; whether this, however, be *actual* or *symbolical* (or allegorical) existence, the context alone must decide. Here it must necessarily have the former sense (against Billroth), for the mere *significance* of a participation would go no way towards proving the proposition that eating meat offered to idols was idolatry ; and as, therefore, in ver. 18. it is not the *significance*, but the *fact* of the participation, that is expressed (comp. ver. 20), so also must it of necessity be here. *What sort of a participation* it might be, was of no importance in the present connec-

sage before us are the utterance of the *Christian consciousness of fellowship*, to which it makes no difference who, in each separate case, may be the ministerial *organ* of the fellowship. Kahnis explains them from the *amen* of the congregation (Justin, *loc. cit.*) ; but that itself was primarily the time-hallowed expression of that consciousness.

¹ With excessive arbitrariness Hofmann (comp. his *Schriftbew.* II. 2, p. 225 f.) insists on taking εὐλογία otherwise than εὐλογοῦμεν ; the former, in the sense of an *ascription of praise*, with *God* as its subject ; the latter, in the sense of *consecrating the cup*. The consecration, according to him, makes the difference between it and the Passover cup. But the said difference could not have been expressed by Paul in a more unsuitable or perplexing way than by repeating the same word.

² Hofmann too comes to this in substance after all, although he tries to escape from

it, taking κοινωνία as “*the matter of fact of a joint (?) participancy*,” and then opining that the apostle has in view an eating of the bread and drinking of the wine, which *by means of* this corporeal process, and without its being possible to eat and drink merely bread and wine, *makes us joint-partakers* of the body and blood of Christ. In support of the meaning thus assigned to κοινωνία, Hofmann appeals inappropriately to i. 9 ; 2 Cor. xiii. 13 ; 1 John i. 3. *Joint participancy* would be συκοινωνία ; comp. συκοινωνός, ix. 23 ; Rom. xi. 17 ; Phil. i. 7.

³ It is plain from vv. 18, 20, 21, that κοινωνία is here neither *communication*, apportioning (Luther, *al.*, including Kling, Billroth), which it never means in the N. T. (see on Rom. xv. 26), nor *consortium, societas* (Erasmus : “quod pariter sanguine Christi sumus redempti,” comp. Zwingli). See also Kahnis, *Abendm.* p. 132 f.

tion, for the apostle is dealing here simply with the *κοινωνία* in itself, not with its nature, which differed according to the different analogies adduced (vv. 18, 20). (N¹) It cannot therefore be gathered from this passage whether he was thinking of some kind of *real*, possibly even *material* connection of those eating and drinking in the Supper with the body and blood of Christ,¹ or, on the other hand, of an *inward* union realized *in the believing consciousness*, consisting therefore in the *spiritual contact* whereby the believer, who partakes of the elements, is conscious to himself in so partaking of being connected by saving appropriation with the body and blood of reconciliation. But we see clearly from xi. 24 f. that Paul *could* only mean the latter, since at the institution of the Supper the body of Christ was not yet slain, and His blood still flowed in His veins.² See, besides, on Matt. xxvi. 26. Again, if the *glorified* state of His body, *i.e.* the *σῶμα τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ* (Phil. iii. 21), set in only with His ascension, and if, when He instituted the Supper, His body was still but the *σῶμα τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ*, which soon after died upon the cross for reconciliation (Col. i. 22), while, nevertheless, the first Lord's Supper, dispensed by *Jesus himself*, must have carried with it the whole specific *essence* of the sacred ordinance—that essence depending precisely upon the *future crucifixion* of the body and *outpouring* of the blood,—then the apostle cannot have in view the *glorified*³ *σῶμα* and *αἷμα* as being given and partaken of through the *medium* of the bread and wine. Otherwise, we should have to attribute to Paul the extravagant conception,—which is, however, equally out of harmony with the institution itself and without shadow of warrant in the apostle's words, nay, at variance with what he says in xv. 50,—that, at the last Supper, Jesus had His pneumatic body already at His disposal to dispense as He would (Olshausen, Hofmann), or that a momentary glorification, like that on the Mount, took

¹ For the rest, it is plain enough from the correlative *σῶμα* that the *αἷμα τ.* X. denotes the *blood*—not, as D. Schulz still maintains, the bloody *death*—of Christ (which, considered *in itself*, it might indeed *symbolize*, but could not *be-called*. Fritzsche, *ad Rom.* I. p. 274; Kahnis, *Abendm.* p. 60 f.).

² When Rodatz objects that an *ideal* union with the actual body slain and blood shed is a *logical contradiction*, he overlooks the fact that the material sphere is not beyond the reach of inward appropriation. Spiritual communion may have reference to a material object, without excluding a symbolic process in which “*signatum non cum signo sed nobiscum unitur*” (Vossius, *de baptismo*, p. 11). Comp. Kahnis, *Dogmat.* I. 621: “Bread and wine form not a mere symbol, but a *sign*, which is at the same time *medium*,” see also III. p. 489. The important alteration in the Latin *Confess. Aug.* Art. X. of 1540, points in the same direction.

³ Rückert also (*Abendm.* p. 224 ff.) holds that Paul conceived the body and blood in

the Supper as *glorified*; that, in virtue of the consecration, the participant partakes of the glorified blood, etc. Rückert, of course, discards all questions as to mode in connection with this view which he ascribes to the apostle, but which he himself considers a baseless one (p. 242). His mistake lies in deducing too much from *πνευματικόν*, which is neither in ver. 3 nor anywhere else in the N. T. the opposite of *material*, but of *natural* (1 Pet. ii. 5 not excluded); and the *πνεῦμα* to which *πνευματικός* refers is always (except Eph. vi. 13, where it is the *diabolic* spirit-world that is spoken of) the *Divine πνεῦμα*. In the case of gifts which are *πνευματικά*, it is this *πνεῦμα* who is always the *agent*; so with the supply of manna and water in the wilderness, and so, too, with the bread and wine received in the Lord's Supper, inasmuch as in this *βρῶμα* and *πόμα* the communion of the body and blood of Christ is realized, which does not take place when bread and wine are partaken of in the ordinary, natural way.

place at the time of instituting the Supper, as Kahnis formerly held ; but see now his *Dogmat.* I. p. 622 ; and comp. also, on the other side, Ebrard, *Dogma vom heilig. Abendm.* I. p. 109 f. Either, therefore, the apostle regarded the *κοινωνία* of Christ's body and blood as being different before His glorification from what it was afterwards, or it was in his eyes, both before and after, the inward spiritual fellowship realized by the inner man through the medium of the symbol partaken of, as an appropriation of the work of atonement consummated through means of His body and blood, and consequently as a real life-fellowship, other than which, indeed, he could not conceive it as realized when the Supper was instituted. Comp. Keim in the *Jahrb. für Deutsche Theol.* 1859, p. 90 ; Weiss, *bibl. Theol.* p. 355. Against this *κοινωνία* subjectively realized in the devout feeling of the believer, and objectively established by the divine institution of the ordinance itself, it is objected that the phrase, "fellowship of the body and blood," expresses at any rate an *interpenetration* of Christ's body and the bread (according to the Lutheran synecdoche ; comp. Kahnis' former view in his *Abendm.* p. 136, also Hofmann, p. 219). But this objection asserts too much, and therefore proves nothing, seeing that the fellowship with Christ's body and blood realized by means of the *symbol* also corresponds to the notion of fellowship, and that all the more, because this eating and drinking of the elements *essentially* is the *specific medium* of the deep, inward, real, and living *κοινωνία* ; hence, too, the "calix communionis" cannot be possibly a *figurata loquutio*. This last point we maintain against Calvin, who, while insisting that "non tollatur *figuræ* veritas," and also that the thing itself is there, namely, that "non minus sanguinis communionem anima percipiat, quam ore vinum bibimus," still explains away the *κοινωνία* of the blood of Christ to the effect, "dum simul omnes nos in corpus suum inserit, ut vivat in nobis et nos in ipso." — *ὃν κλῶμεν*] There was no need to repeat here that the bread, too, was hallowed by a prayer of thanksgiving, after the *cup* had been already so carefully described as a cup consecrated *for the Supper*. Instead of doing so, Paul enriches his representation by mention of the other *essential symbolic action* with the bread ; comp. xi. 24. That the breaking of the bread, however, was *itself* the *consecration* (Rückert), the narrative of the institution will not allow us to assume. — τοῦ σώματος τ. X.] in the strict, not in the figurative sense, as Stroth, Rosenmüller, Schulthess, and others : "declaramus nos esse membra corporis Christi, i.e. societatis Christianæ," comp. also Baur, *neut. Theol.* p. 201. This interpretation is at variance with the first clause, for which the meaning of the Supper as first instituted forbids such a figurative explanation (in opposition to Zwingli ¹) ; nor can this be justified by ver. 17 ; for

¹ Zwingli, in his *Respon. ad Bugenh.*, explains it thus : "Poculum gratiarum actionis, quo gratias agimus, quid quaeso, aliud est quam nos ipsi ? Nos enim quid aliud sumus nisi ipsa communio, ipse coetus et populus, consortium et sodalitas sanguinis Christi ? h. e. ille ipse populus, qui sanguine Christi ablatus est." The most thorough

historical development of Zwingli's doctrine is that given by Dieckhoff in his *evang. Abendmahlslehre im Reformationszeitalter*, I. p. 428 ff. Rückert remarks with justice that Zwingli has here lost his footing on evangelical ground altogether. But Calvin, too, has lost it, inasmuch as he makes everything turn upon the spiritual recep-

Ver. 17 confirms the statement that the bread is a communion of the body of Christ. *For it is one bread ; one body are we, the many, i.e. for through one bread being eaten in the Supper, we Christians, although as individuals we are many, form together one (ethical) body.* This union into one body through participation on the one bread could not take place unless this bread were *κοινωνία* of the body of Christ, which is just that which produces the one body—that which constitutes the many into this unity. The proof advances *ab effectu* (which participating in the one bread *in and of itself* could not have) *ad causam* (which can only lie in this, that this bread is the communion of Christ's body). The argument¹ does not imply a *logical conversion* (as Rodatz objects) ; but either the effect or the cause might be *posited from the Christian consciousness as premiss*, according as the case required. See a similar process of reasoning *ab effectu ad causam* in xii. 12. Comp. also Luke vii. 47. According to this, *ὅτι* is just the *since, because (for)*, so common in argument, and there is no need whatever to substitute *γάρ* for it (Hofmann's objection) ; *ἐστί* is to be supplied after *εἰς ἄρτος* ; and the two clauses are placed side by side *asyndetically* so as to make the passage "alacrior et nervosior" (Dissen, *ad Pind. Exc.* II. p. 276), and, in particular, to bring out with more emphasis the idea of *unity* (*εἰς . . . ἓν*) (comp. Acts xxv. 12). The *οἱ γὰρ πάντες κ.τ.λ.* which follows leaves us no room to doubt how the asyndeton should logically be filled up (*and therefore also*) ; for this last clause of the verse excludes the possibility of our assuming a mere relation of *comparison* (as there is one bread, so are we one body ; comp. Heydenreich, de Wette, Osiander, Neander, *al.*). The *οἱ γὰρ πάντες*, too, forbids our supplying *ἐσμέν* after *ἄρτος* (Zwingli, Piscator, Mosheim, Stolz, Schrader, comp. Ewald) ; for these words indicate the presence of another conception, inasmuch as, repeating the idea conveyed in *εἰς ἄρτος*, they thereby show that that *εἰς ἄρτος* was said of *literal* bread. This holds against Olshausen also, who discovers here the *church* as being "*the bread of life for the world!*" Other expositors take *ὅτι* (comp. xii. 15 f. ; Gal. iv. 6) as introducing a protasis, and *ἐν σ. κ.τ.λ.* as being the apodosis : "*because it is one bread, therefore are we, the many, one body.*"² In that case either we should have a further exposition about the bread (Hofmann), no sign of which, however, follows ; or else this whole thought would be purely parenthetical, a practical conclusion being drawn in passing from what had just been stated. But how remote from the connection would such a side-thought be ! And would not Paul have required to interpose an *οὖν*, or some such word, after the *ὅτι*, in order to avoid misunderstanding ? Interpreters would

tion of the *glorified* body, *i.e.* upon receiving the vivifying power which flows from it, whereas the words of institution have to do simply with that body, *which was to be crucified for the atonement* and with *its* fellowship. As to Calvin's doctrine of the Supper, see, besides Henry and Stähelin, Kahn, II. p. 494 ff.

¹ Comp. Bengel : "Probat poculum et panem esse *communione*. Nam panis per

se non facit, ut vescentes sint unum corpus, sed panis id facit quatenus est *communio*," etc.

² Flatt, Rückert, Kahn, Maier, Hofmann, following the Vulgate, Castalio, Calvin, Beza, Bengel, *al.* Rückert, however, has since assented (*Abendm.* p. 229 ff.) to the modifications proposed by Rodatz, of which mention is presently to be made.

not have betaken themselves to a device so foreign to the scope of the passage, had they not too hastily assumed that ver. 17 contained no explanation at all of what preceded it (Rückert). Rodatz agrees with the rest in rendering : "because there is one bread, therefore are we, the many, one body," but makes this not a subordinate thought brought in by the way, but an essentially *new* point in the argument ; he does this, however, by supplying after ἐν σῶμα, "*with Christ the Head*" (comp. also van Hengel, *Annot.* p. 167 f.), and finding the *progress* of the thought in the words supplied. But in this way the very point on which all turned would be left to be filled in, which is quite unwarrantable ; Paul would have needed to write ἐν σῶμα αὐτοῦ τῆς κεφαλῆς, or something to that effect, in order to be understood. — οἱ πολλοί] correlative to the ἐν σῶμα (comp. v. 15, 19): *the many*, who are fellow-participants in the Lord's Supper, *the Christian multitude*. The very same, viewed, however, in the aspect of their *collective aggregate*, not, as here, of their multitudinousness, are οἱ πάντες, *the whole* ; comp. Rom. v. 15, 18. The *unity* of *bread* is not to be understood *numerically* (Grotius, who, from that point of view, lays stress upon its size), but *qualitatively*, as one and the same *bread of the Supper*. The thought of the bread having become a unity out of many separate grains of corn is foreign to the connection, although insisted on by many expositors, such as Chrysostom, Augustine, Erasmus, Calovius, *al.* — ἐκ τοῦ ἐνὸς ἄρτου μετέχ. is interpreted by some as if there were no ἐκ : "since we are all partakers of one bread" (Luther). This is contrary to the linguistic usage, for μετέχειν is joined with the genitive (ver. 21, ix. 12) or accusative (Bernhardy, p. 149), but never with ἐκ ; and the assumption that Paul, in using ἐκ, was thinking of the verb ἐσθίειν (xi. 28), is altogether arbitrary. The linguistically correct rendering is : *for we all have a share from the one bread*, so that in analyzing the passage we have to supply, according to a well-known usage (Buttmann, *neut. Gr.* p. 138 [E. T. 158]), the indefinite indication of a part, τί or τινός, before ἐκ τοῦ ἐνὸς ἄρτου. Hofmann, too, gives the correct partitive sense to the expression. The article before ἐνός points back to what has been already said.

Ver. 18. *Another*¹ analogue to prove that participation in the sacrificial feasts is idolatry. — κατὰ σάρκα] without the link of the article, because Ἰσρ. κατὰ σάρκα is regarded as a single idea. Comp. on Rom. ix. 3. *Israel after a purely human sort* means *the born Israelites*, the Jews, as distinguished from the Ἰσρ. κατὰ πνεῦμα (Rom. ii. 28 f. ; Gal. iv. 29 ; comp. Gal. vi. 16), which the Christians are, in virtue of their fellowship of life with Christ the promised σπέρμα of Abraham. It was very natural for the apostle to add κατὰ σάρκα, seeing that he had just been speaking of the sacred ordinance of *the Christians*. — As to the *Jewish* sacrificial feasts, see Michaelis, *Mos. R.* II. pp. 282, 346 f., IV. § 189. — κοινωνοὶ τοῦ θυσιαστ.] This is the theocratic bond of participation, whereby the man stands bound to the sacrificial altar, who eats of the sacrifice belong to it as such. The Israelite who refused to

¹ Which does not therefore by any means place the Lord's Supper in the light of a sacrificial feast (Olshausen, Harnack,

Gemeindegottesd. p. 195 ; comp. also Kahnis, *Abendm.* p. 30). See against this view, Hofmann, *Schriftbew.* II. 2, p. 232.

eat of the flesh of the sacrifice as such, would thereby practically declare that he had nothing to do with the altar, but stood aloof from the sphere of theocratic connection with it. The man, on the other hand, who ate a portion of the flesh offered upon the altar, gave proof of the religious relation in which he stood to the altar itself. The question which may be asked, *Why did not Paul write Θεοῦ instead of θυσιαστ.?* is not to be answered by affirming that he could not ascribe the κοιν. τοῦ Θεοῦ εἰςί to the Ἰσρ. κ. σάρκα (Rückert, *Abendm.* p. 217, and Neander; but could he not in truth, according to Rom. ix. 4 f., xi. 1, say this of the people of God?), or by asserting that he could not well have attributed so high an effect to the sacrificial service (de Wette; but why should he not, seeing he does not specify any particular *kind* of fellowship with God?). But the true reply is this: the κοινωνία Θεοῦ would have been here much too vague and remote a conception; for that fellowship belonged to the Jew already in his national capacity as one of the people of God generally, even apart from partaking of the sacrifices. It was by the latter that he showed the narrower and more specific relation of worship in which he stood to God, namely, the peculiarly sacred κοινωνία (Ex. xx. 21 ff.) τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου. Hence the inappropriateness of the view taken by Rückert and many others, that Paul leaves the inference open: "and hence, too, with God," and of that of Rodatz, that the altar is put for the *offering*.

Vv. 19, 20. By these two analogues, vv. 16–18, the apostle has now justified his warning given above against the sacrificial feasts as a warning against idolatry (ver. 14). But from the case of the Jewish sacrificial eating last adduced, his readers might easily draw the inference: "You declare, then, the idolatrous offerings and the idols to be what the heathen count them?" For whereas the apostle adduced the κοινωνία of the Jewish θυσιαστήριον, and that as an analogue of the heathen θυσιαστήρια, he seemed thereby to recognize the κοινωνία of these too, and consequently also the real divine existence of the idols thus adored. He therefore himself puts the possible false inference in the shape of a question (ver. 19), and then annuls it in ver. 20 by adducing the wholly different results to which ver. 18 in reality gives rise. The inference, namely, is drawn only from ver. 18, not from vv. 16–18 (de Wette, Osiander, Hofmann, *al.*), as ver. 20 (θύουσιν, correlative to the θυσιαστηρίου of ver. 18) shows. — τὶ οὖν φημι;] *what do I maintain then?* namely, in following up ver. 18. Upon this way of exciting attention by a question, comp. Dissen, *ad Demosth. de cor.* p. 347. Krüger, *Anab.* i. 4. 14. — τὶ ἐστίν] *is something*, i.e. *has reality*, namely, as εἰδωλόθυτον, so that it is really flesh which is consecrated to a god, as the heathen think; and as εἰδωλον, so that it really is a divine being answering to the conception which the heathen have of it; as if, for instance, there were such a being as Jupiter in existence, who actually possessed the attributes and so forth ascribed to him by the heathen. To accent the words τι ἐστίν (Billroth, Tischendorf, comp. Ewald) would give the sense: *that any idol-sacrifice (and any idol) exists*, in the capacity, that is to say, *of idol-sacrifice and of idol*. Either rendering harmonizes with viii. 4. In opposition to the latter of the two, it must not be said, with Rückert, that ἐστι would need to come immediately after ὅτι,

for the last place, too, is the seat of emphasis (Kühner, II. p. 625) ; nor yet, with de Wette, that the one half (*εἰδωλόθυτον*) is not so suitable, for the context surely makes it perfectly plain that Paul is not speaking of *absolute* existence. But since both renderings are equally good as regards sense and expression, we can decide between them only on this ground, that with the second the *τί* would be superfluous, whereas with the first—which, following the Vulgate, is the common one—it has significance, which should give it the preference. At the same time, we must not insert any pregnancy of meaning like that in iii. 7 (*of influence and effect*) into the *τί*, as Hofmann does without warrant from the context ; but it is the simple *aliquid*, the opposite of the non-real, of the *non-ens*. — *ἀλλ'* refers to the negative sense of the preceding question. Hence : “*No ; on the contrary, I maintain,*” etc. See Hartung, *Partikell.* II. p. 37 ; Baumelein, p. 10 f. — *ἀ θύουσιν* see the critical remarks. The subject is self-evident : *the sacrificers* (the *heathen*, who sacrifice). Kühner, II. p. 35 f.—The assertion, again, that the heathen sacrifices are presented to *demons* and not to a real God (*Θεῷ*), *follows* (*οὖν*, in ver. 19) from the fellowship in which the Jew who ate of the sacrifices stood to the altar on which they were offered ; inasmuch as confessedly it was only the *Jewish θυσιαστήριον* with its sacrifice that belonged to a real God, and consequently the heathen *θυσιαστήρια* and their offerings could not have reference to a God, but only to beings of an opposite kind, *i.e.* demons. — *δαίμονις* does not mean *idols*, false or imaginary gods (Bos, Mosheim, Valckenaer, Zachariae, Rosenmüller, Heydenreich, Flatt, Pott, Neander), which is contrary to the uniform usage of the LXX. and the N. T.,¹ and would, moreover, yield a thought quite out of keeping with the context ; for it was the apostle's aim to point to a connection with an antichristian *reality*. The word means, as always in the N. T., *demons, diabolic spirits*. That the heathen worships *quoad eventum* (of course not *quoad intentionem*) were offered to devils, was a view derived by all the later Jews with strict logical consistency from the premisses of a pure monotheism and its opposite. See the LXX. rendering of Deut. xxxii. 17 ; Ps. cvi. 37,—a reminiscence of which we have in Paul's expression here,—Ps. xcv. 5 ; Bar. iv. 7 ; Tob. iii. 8, vi. 14, and the Rabbinical writers quoted in Eisenmenger's *entdeckt. Judenth.* I. pp. 805 ff., 816 ff. So Paul, too, makes the real existences answering to the heathen conceptions of the gods, to be *demons*, which is essentially connected with the Christian idea that heathendom is the realm of the devil ; for, according to this idea, the various individual beings regarded by the heathen as gods can be nothing else but diabolic spirits, who collectively make up the whole imperial host of the *ἀρχων τοῦ κόσμου τούτου* (Eph. ii. 2, vi. 12), who is himself the *ἀρχηγός*.² Comp. Hahn, *Theol. des*

¹ Acts xvii. 18 is uttered by *Greeks* according to *their* sense of the word ; but in Rev. ix. 20 we are to understand *demons* as meant.

² Mosheim objects that if Paul held this belief, he must have pronounced the sacrificial meat to be positively unclean. But it had surely received no *character indelebil-*

is through its being set apart for the altar. If not partaken of *in its quality as sacrificial meat*, it had lost its relation to the demons, and had become *ordinary* meat, just as Jewish sacrificial flesh, too, retained the consecration of the altar only for him *who ate it as such*.

N. Test. I. p. 366 f.; Weiss, *bibl. Theol.* p. 279. The ancient church, too, followed Paul in remaining true to this idea. See Grotius on this passage. Usteri, *Lehrbegr.* p. 421 ff. As to the consistency of this view with that expressed in viii. 4, see the remarks on the latter verse. Rückert therefore (with Grotius) is wrong in altering the representation to this effect, that according to Paul the demons had “*given the heathen to believe*” that there were gods to whom men should sacrifice, in order to obtain for themselves under their name divine worship and offerings, and that *in so far* the sacrifices of the heathen were presented to demons. The LXX. rendering of Deut. xxxii. 17 and Ps. xcv. 5 should of itself have been enough to prevent any such paraphrase of the direct dative-relation. — οὐ θέλω δὲ κ.τ.λ.] *that I, however, do not wish*, still dependent upon ὅτι, the reply to τὶ οὖν φημι being only thus completed. The κοινωνοὺς points back to κοινων. in ver. 18. The article in τῶν δαίμ. denotes this *class* of beings.

Ver. 21 gives the ground of the foregoing οὐ θέλω δὲ ὑμᾶς κ.τ.λ. — οὐ δύνασθε] of *moral* impossibility. “Nihil convenit inter Christum et impios daemones; utrisque serviri simul non potest nisi cum insigni contumelia Christi,” Erasmus, *Paraph.* Comp. 2 Cor. vi. 15. — ποτήριον Κυρίου] *a cup having reference to the Lord, i.e.* according to ver. 16 : *a cup which brings into communion with Christ.* Its analogue is a ποτήριον δαιμονίων; the latter was *quoad eventum*, according to ver. 20, the cup out of which men drank at the sacrificial feast, inasmuch as the whole feast, and therefore also the wine used at it, even apart from the libation (which Grotius, Munthe, Michaelis, de Wette, and others suppose to be meant), made the partakers to be κοινωνοὺς τῶν δαίμων. (ver. 20). — τραπέζης Κυρίου] refers to the whole κυριακὸν δεῖπνον, xi. 20. Instances of μετέχειν with τραπέζης, and like expressions, may be seen in Loesner, *Obss.* p. 288.

Ver. 22. *Or do we provoke the Lord to jealousy?* to prove that He will not suffer us to set Him on the same level with the demons? The connection is this: “*You cannot, etc., ver. 21, unless it were the case that we Christians were people whose business it is to provoke Christ to jealousy.*” Hence the *indicative*, which should not be taken as *deliberative*, with Luther and others, including Pott, Flatt, and Rückert (*or would we defy the Lord?*), but: *we occupy ourselves therewith, are engaged therein.* Comp. Bernhardt, *Syntax*, p. 370. The phrase, τὸν Κύριον, however, should not be referred to God on the ground of the allusion undoubtedly made here to Deut. xxxii. 21 (so *commonly*, as by Ewald, Pott, Billroth, Rückert, Olshausen), but (as by de Wette and Hofmann), on account of ver. 21, to *Christ*. — μὴ ἰσχυρ. κ.τ.λ.] *we are not surely stronger than He?* *i.e.* we are not surely persons, whom His strength, which He would put forth against us to carry out the promptings of that jealousy,¹ cannot get the better of? Comp. Job xxxvii. 23. Chrys-

¹ According to Hofmann, Paul means *that* strength, which men must suppose themselves to possess if they are confident that they can take part *with impunity* in the sacrificial feasts, whereas Christ can by no means endure the sight of such participa-

tion on their part without becoming jealous. But the idea, “*with impunity*,” would be arbitrarily imported into the passage. The greater strength, upon this view of it, would be in truth the capacity—not existing in Christ—to *do what was morally impossible*

ostom already correctly notes the *abductio ad absurdum*, with which Paul winds up this part of his polemic against the eating of sacrificial meat.

Ver. 23. In connection, however, with this matter also, as with a former one, vi. 12, the principle of Christian *liberty in things indifferent* admitted of application, and had no doubt been applied in Corinth itself. Paul therefore now proceeds to treat the subject from this purely ethical side, introducing the new section without any connective particle (Buttmann, *neut. Gram.* p. 345 [E. T. 403], and enunciating in the first place the aforesaid principle itself, coupled, however, with its qualifying condition of love. Thereafter in ver. 24 he lays down the general maxims arising out of this qualification ; and then in vv. 25 ff. the special rules bearing upon the eating of meat offered in sacrifice. — οἰκοδομεῖ] promotes the Christian life of the brethren, viii. 1. Comp. on Rom. xiv. 19. See the counterpart to this in Rom. xiv. 13, 15, 20. — As to συμφέρει, see on vi. 12.

Ver. 24. *Let no one be striving to satisfy his own interest, but, etc.* Comp. ver. 33. We must not impair the *ideal*, to which this rule gives absolute expression (otherwise in Phil. ii. 4), by supplying μόνον and καί, as Grotius and others do. See rather Rom. xv. 1 f. Even the limitation to the question in hand about sacrificial feasts (Pott), or to the *adiaphora* in general (Billroth, de Wette, Osiander), is unwarranted ; for the special duty of the οἰκοδομεῖν is included under this quite general rule, the application of which to the matter in dispute is not to come till afterwards. — After ἀλλά we are mentally to supply ἕκαστος from the preceding μηδεὶς. See Bernhardt, p. 458 ; Stallbaum, *ad Plat. Symp.* p. 192 E, *Rep.* p. 366 C ; Buttmann, *neut. Gr.* p. 336 [E. T. 392].

Ver. 25. On μάκελλον, *shambles, slaughter-house* (Varro, *de ling. Lat.* 4, p. 35 ; Dio Cass. lxi. 18), see Kypke, II. p. 219. Comp. Plut. *Mor.* 752 C : μακελεῖα. It passed over into the Rabbinical writings also ; see Drus. *in loc.* — μηδὲν ἀνακρίν.] *making no investigation* (Vulg. *interrogantes* ; not : *condemning*, as Grotius, Ewald, and others take it, contrary to the meaning of the word), *i.e.* instituting no inquiry about any of the pieces of meat exposed for sale, as to whether it had been offered in sacrifice or not. The *weaker* Christians, that is to say, were afraid of the possibility (see on viii. 7) of their buying sacrificial meat at the flesh-market, because they had not yet risen to see that the flesh of the victims when brought to the public mart had lost its sacrificial character and had become ordinary meat. They would probably, therefore, often enough make anxious inquiries over their purchases whether this or that piece might have been offered at the altar or not. The *stronger* believers did not act in this way ; and Paul approves their conduct, and enjoins all to do the same. — διὰ τὴν συνείδησιν] may be taken as referring either (1) to μηδὲν ἀνακρίνοντες as to the required mode of the πᾶν ἐσθίειν : eat all *without inquiry, in order that your conscience may*

(ver. 21). Had this, however, been the apostle's meaning, he would have needed, in order to be logical and intelligible, to reverse the order of his clauses, so that ἰσχυρότεροι should have its sense determined by

οὐ δύνασθε in ver. 21. According to the present order, the meaning of ἰσχυρ. is determined by παραζηλοῦμεν to be *the strength* which could *make head* against that of the ζῆλος thus aroused.

not be troubled, which would be the case if you were told : This is meat offered to idols (so Erasmus, Rosenmüller, Hofmann, and others, following Chrysostom) ;¹ or (2) simply to ἀνακρίνοντες : *without making any inquiry on grounds of conscience*. So Castalio, Calvin, Beza, *al.*, including Billroth and Ewald (the latter, however, rendering : “*condemning* nothing on account of conscience”). The second method of connection is preferable, both because it gives the simplest and most direct sense for διὰ τ. συνείδ., and also because of the τοῦ γὰρ Κυρίου κ.τ.λ. that follows,—words by which Paul designs to show that, as regards such questions about food, there is really no room for holding a court of conscience to decide upon the lawfulness or unlawfulness of eating. He means then that his readers should partake freely of all flesh sold in the flesh-market, without for conscience’ sake entering into an inquiry whether any of it had or had not been sacrificial flesh. The flesh offered for sale was to be *flesh* to them, and nothing more ; conscience had no call whatever to make any inquiry in the matter ; for the earth is the Lord’s, etc., ver. 26. Other interpreters understand *the conscience of others* to be meant : “No investigation should be made . . . lest, if it turned out to be sacrificial flesh, the conscience of any one should be rendered uneasy, or be defiled by participation in the food ;” so Rückert, and so in substance Vatablus, Bengel, Mosheim, and others, including Flatt, Pott, Heydenreich, de Wette, Osiander, Maier. Comp. viii. 7, 10. But it could occur to none of the apostle’s readers to take τὴν συνείδ. as referring to anything but their own individual conscience. It is otherwise in ver. 28, where δι’ ἐκεῖνον τὸν μηνύσ. prepares us for the transition to the conscience of another person ; while the οὐχὶ τὸν ἑαυτοῦ in ver. 29 shows that in vv. 25 and 27 it was just the reader’s *own* conscience that was meant.

Ver. 26 supplies the religious ground for the injunction just given : μηδὲν ἀνακρίνειν διὰ τ. συνείδησιν, expressed in the words of Ps. xxiv. 1 (comp. Ps. l. 12), which Paul here makes his own. (o¹) If the earth and its fulness belong to God, how should it be necessary before using somewhat of them for food to institute an investigation on grounds of conscience, as if such gifts of God could be in themselves unholy, or involve sin in the use of them ? Comp. 1 Tim. iv. 4. For the rest, the passage affords another proof that the apostle had now in principle gone beyond the standpoint of the decree of Acts xv. Comp. on viii. 1, Remark. — As to πλήρωμα, *id.*, *quo res impletur*, see Fritzsche, *ad Rom.* II. p. 469 ff. Calvin had already put the point well : “Terra enim, si arboribus, herbis, animalibus et aliis rebus careret, esset tanquam domus . . . *vacua*.”

Ver. 27. Δέ] of continuation. In the matter of *invitations* too the same principle holds good, only with the incidental limitation adduced in ver. 28. Note the *emphasis* conveyed by the *unusual* place of the καλεῖ, in contrast to the τὸ ἐν μακέλλῳ πωλούμ. which has been already spoken of. Attention is thus called to the fact that a *second* and a *new* situation is now to be discussed ; before, the reader was in the *flesh-market* ; now, he is a *guest at a feast*. — It is plain, at the same time, from ver. 28, that what is meant is not

¹ “Vitandum enim est offendiculum, si incidat, non accersendum,” Erasmus adds in his Paraphrase with fine exegetical discernment.

the invitation to *festivals in express connection with sacrifice*, but to other heathen feasts, at which, however, flesh offered to idols might occur ; for in the case of a sacrificial feast the *ιερόθυτόν ἐστι* was a matter of course. — *καὶ θέλετε πορ.*] “Admonet tacite, melius forte facturos, si non cant, ire tamen non prohibet,” Grotius.

Ver. 28. *Ἐὰν δέ τις κ.τ.λ.*] *But should it so happen that some one, etc.* It is clear from this that the *host* (Grotius, Mosheim, Semler) is not meant, otherwise *τις* (ver. 27) would not be repeated, and besides, *δι' ἐκεῖνον*. . . *συνείδησιν* would not suit ; but a *fellow-guest*, and that not a *heathen* (Chrysostom, Theophylact, Erasmus, *al.*, including de Wette and Maier, according to whom the thing is done maliciously, or to put the Christian to the test¹), nor a heathen or Christian indifferently (Flatt), nor a *Jew* (Wetstein), but a *Christian fellow-guest* (Osiander, Neander, *al.*), who, being himself still under the influence of the ideas about sacrificial flesh, warns his fellow-believer at the table against defilement ; and, moreover, a *Gentile Christian* (see remark on viii. 7), who had somehow learned—perhaps only since coming to the house—that the flesh from the altar was to form part of the feast.² According to Reiche, in his *Comment. crit.*, we should not seek to define the *τις* more specially, but leave it quite general. But this is at variance with the apodosis, which takes for granted that, in the case supposed, eating of flesh would involve a *want of forbearance* towards the *μηνύσας*, as was obviously implied of necessity in the *διά* after what had already been said in viii. 7–13. The *τις*, therefore, must be one whose conscience required to be spared, consequently neither a heathen nor a Jew, but, in accordance with viii. 7 ff., only a *brother* who was of weak conscience. This holds against Hofmann also, who assumes that the case supposed in ver. 28 might occur just as well if the *seller* knew the buyer to be a Christian as if the *host* or any of his *family* knew the guest as such. To leave the *τις* thus indefinite is, besides, the more clearly wrong, seeing that the rule for *buying* meat had been finally disposed of in vv. 25, 26, and cannot extend into ver. 28, because ver. 28 is included under the case of the *invitation* brought forward in ver. 27, and this case again is very distinctly separated by the very order of the words (see on ver. 27) from that of the *purchase* in the market, ver. 25. — *δι' ἐκεῖνον τ. μηνύσ. κ. τ. συνείδ.*] *for the sake of him who made it known, and of conscience, i.e. in order to spare him and not to injure conscience.* The (*διά*) *τὴν συνείδησιν* is the *refrain* which serves to give the motive for the rules laid down since ver. 25. To *whose* conscience this refrain points *here*, Paul does not yet say (else he would have added *αὐτοῦ*), but utters again first of all this moral watchword without any more precise definition, in order immediately thereafter in ver. 29 to express with the special emphasis of contrast the particular reference of its meaning designed

¹ Ewald, too, holds the *τις* to be a *heathen* (“the host, as most interpreters take it, or very possibly a companion at the table”), who gave the hint in a frank and kindly way, as not expecting that a Christian would partake of meat of that sort.

² De Wette’s objection, that one of such tender conscience would hardly have gone to a heathen festival at all, carries weight only on the supposition of a *sacrificial* feast being meant.

here;¹ for in vv. 25, 27, the *συνείδησις* had a *different* meaning. This κ. τ. *συνείδησιν*, therefore (the *καί* here being the simple *and*), carries with it something to *whet curiosity*; it stands forth in the first place as a sort of *riddle*, so to speak, which is to find its solution in ver. 29.—Regarding *μηνύς*, see on Luke xx. 37. If we imagine the *μηνύς* to be a *heathen*, the κ. τ. *συνείδ.* lands us in an insoluble difficulty. For *either* (1) we should, with Ewald, suppose that this heathen's view of the matter was, that the Christian, being warned, would not eat, but, on the other hand, if he did, would be still worse than a Jew, converting liberty into licentiousness; comp. Erasmus, *Paraphr.*² But in that case how very obscurely Paul would have expressed himself, especially when in the whole context *συνείδησις* means *the Christian consciousness raising scruples for itself*, and that in respect of what was lawful or unlawful! Or (2) we should have, with de Wette, to take *τὴν συνείδησιν* as not the conscience of the *μηνύς* at all, but that of third persons (weak Christians), which, however, ver. 29 forbids us to do, unless we are to regard Paul as writing with excessive awkwardness. — *ιερόθυτον*] used of sacrificial flesh also in Plutarch, *Mor.* p. 729 C. The term is *purposely chosen* here instead of *ειδωλόθυτον*, as a more honourable expression, because the words are spoken at table *in the presence of heathen*. We may be sure that this delicate touch is due to no corrector of the text (in opposition to de Wette and Reiche). As to the usage of the word in Greek, see Lobeck, *ad Phryn.* p. 159.

Ver. 29 f. Lest now any one should understand this *last* διὰ τ. *συνείδ.* as meaning *one's own* conscience, as in vv. 25, 27, and so *misunderstand* Paul with his high views of Christian freedom, he adds here this emphatic explanation, and the reason in which it rests (*ἵνατί γάρ . . .* ver. 30). — *τὴν ἑαυτοῦ*] *his own individual* conscience, his, namely, who was warned. — *τοῦ ἑτέρου*] *of the other in the case*, points back to the *τὸν μηνύσαντα*, whose conscience, too, is afterwards included under *ἄλλης συνειδήσεως*. — *ἵνατί γάρ κ.τ.λ.*] *For why is my liberty*, etc., that is: *for it is absurd that another man's conscience should pronounce sentence* (of condemnation) *upon my liberty* (my moral freedom from obligation as regards such things, indifferent as they are in themselves). This is the *reason*, why Paul does not mean one's own conscience when he says that to spare conscience one should abstain from eating in the case supposed (ver. 28), but the conscience of the other. One's own conscience, the distinctive moral element in one's own self-consciousness, does not *need* such consideration; for it remains unaffected by the judgment passed and slander uttered, seeing that both are without foundation. The only motive for the abstinence, therefore, is the sparing of the conscience of others, not the danger to one's own. Similarly Bengel; comp. de Wette. The *ordinary* interpretation³ is that of Chrysostom, taking the

¹ Hence τ. *συνείδ.* should not be understood of conscience *in abstracto* (Hofmann: "conscience as such, no matter whose," although *in the first place* that of the *μηνύς*).

² Similarly Hofmann also thinks of the "bad opinion of Christianity" which the *μηνύς*. first of all, but others as well, would

have occasion to form, so that the Christian's liberty would be subject to the tribunal of the moral consciousness of others.

³ Adopted by Heydenreich, Flatt, Billroth, Rückert, Olshausen, Neander, Maier, Ewald, Hofmann; Osiander is undecided.

words as the reason for the rule in ver. 28, in the sense of : "For why should I give occasion to others to pass judgment upon me and to speak evil?" or, "There is no reason for letting it come to such a pass, that a Christian's liberty should be subjected to that tribunal of the moral consciousness of others," Hofmann. But even apart from the fact that the text says nothing about "giving occasion," or "letting it come to such a pass," it is a very arbitrary proceeding to take a clause standing in such a marked way in the course of the argument as *συνείδησιν* . . . *ἑτέρου*, and to thrust it aside as something only incidentally appended. The connection, too, of the conditional protasis with the interrogative *τί* in the apodosis in ver. 30, makes it clear enough that Paul wishes to bring out the *absurdity* of the relation between the two conceptions. Comp. Rom. iii. 7, *al.* Vatablus, Schulz, and Pott find here and in ver. 30 the objection of an opponent "ad infirmitatem fratrum suorum se conformare nolentis." The *γάρ* is not inconsistent with this (see Fritzsche, *ad Matth.* p. 807), but the *οὖν* is (ver. 31). — Observe the difference between *τοῦ ἑτέρου* (*alterius*) and *ἄλλης* (*alius*, i.e. *alienae*), by which *any other* conscience *whatever* is meant. — *χάριτι*] Dative of the manner : *gratefully, with thanks*. Comp. Eph. ii. 5, where, however, the context shows that the meaning is *by grace* ; see in general, Bernhardt, p. 100 f. It refers to the grace at meat. By understanding it as *beneficio Dei* (Beza, Grotius, Heydenreich, Hofmann), we bring in *Dei* entirely without warrant, and overlook the parallel *εὐχαριστῶ*, the idea of which is the same with that of *χάριτι*. — The twice-used *ἐγώ* is emphatic : *I for my part*. — *μετέχω*] The object of the verb is self-evident : food and drink. Comp. *ὑπὲρ οὗ*. — *εὐχαριστῶ*] "Gratiarum actio cibum omnem sanctificat, auctoritatem idolorum negat, Dei assèrit ; 1 Tim. iv. 3 f. ; Rom. xiv. 6," Bengel.

Vv. 31–33. The section treating expressly of the participation in sacrifices has been brought to a close. There now follow, introduced by *οὖν* (which here marks the inference of the general from the particular), some additional admonitions, in which are expressed the leading moral rules *for all right Christian conduct* ; ἀπὸ τοῦ προκειμένου ἐπὶ τὸ καθολικὸν ἐξήγαγε τὴν παραινέσιν, ἕνα κάλλιστον ὅρον ἡμῖν δοῦς, τὸ τὸν Θεὸν διὰ πάντων δοξάζεσθαι, Chrysostom. — *ἐσθίετε* and *πίνετε* are to be understood in a perfectly *general* sense, although the subject which the apostle had been handling hitherto naturally suggested the words. Rückert is wrong in holding that it would be more correct if *ἐάν* stood in place of *εἰ*. The *εἰ* is here also "particula plane logica, et quae simpliciter ad cogitationem refertur," Hermann, *ad Viger.* p. 834. *Τί*, again, does not stand for the Attic *ὅτι οὖν* (Rückert), but the emphasis is on *ποιεῖτε* : be it that ye *eat*, or *drink*, or *do* anything ; so that the three cases are : *eating, drinking, acting*. — *πάντα*] without any limitation whatever. "Magnum axioma," Bengel. A Christian's *collective* action should be directed harmoniously towards the one end of redounding *to the glory of God* ; for all truly Christian conduct and work is a practical glorifying of God. Comp. vi. 20 ; Eph. i. 12 ; Phil. i. 11 ; 1 Pet. iv. 11 ; John xv. 8. The opposite : Rom. ii. 23. (P¹)

Ver. 32. Ἀπρόσκοποι] become *inoffensive* (by constantly increasing completeness of Christian virtue). See on Phil. i. 10. — καὶ Ἰουδ. καὶ Ἑλλ. καὶ

τ. ἐκκλ. τοῦ Θεοῦ] *i.e.* for non-Christians and for Christians. The former are spoken of *under two divisions*. It is a mistake to suppose, with Beza, that the reference is to Jewish and Gentile *Christians*, which is at variance with καὶ τῇ ἐκκλ. τοῦ Θεοῦ, since the three repetitions of καὶ stand on the same level. Hence also it will not do to lay all the emphasis, as Billroth does, upon τῇ ἐκκλ. τοῦ Θεοῦ, although it is true that it is designated in a significant way, as in xi. 22. The rule is clearly quite a general one; and it places on the same level the three classes with whom intercourse must be held without giving any occasion for moral offence.

Ver. 33. Πάντα πᾶσιν ἀρέσκω] See ix. 19 ff. πάντα, *in every respect*, ix. 25. ἀρέσκω, *am at the service of*. It denotes what takes place on the apostle's side through his endeavour, namely, to be the servant of all, and to be all things to all men (ix. 19 ff.); not the result of his endeavour, as if he actually did please all (see on Gal. i. 10); for πᾶσιν ἀρέσκειν τὸν συμβουλευόντα καὶ τὰ κοινὰ πράττοντα ἀδύνατον, Dem. 1481.4. Comp. Rom. xv. 2; 1 Thess. ii. 4. — τῶν πολλῶν] *of the many*, the multitude, opposed to the unity of his own single person. Comp. on ix. 19; Rom. v. 15; and on the idea, Clement, *ad Cor.* I. 48: ζητεῖν τὸ κοινωφελὲς πᾶσιν, καὶ μὴ τὸ ἑαυτοῦ. — ἵνα σωθῶσι] *ultimate end*, for the sake of which he sought their good: that they might be sharers in the *Messianic salvation*. Comp. ix. 22. "Ex eo dijudicandum utile," Bengel.

NOTES BY AMERICAN EDITOR.

(J¹) "*In the cloud.*" Ver. 2.

This view agrees with the representation of the cloud in the Rabbinical books: "It encompassed the camp of the Israelites as a wall encompasses a city." It is hardly necessary to make much of the *typical* relation upon which Meyer insists. The point of similarity which the Apostle makes is that the display of God's power in the cloud and in the sea constituted the people disciples of Moses. "It inaugurated the congregation, and, as it were, baptized them to him, bound them to serve and follow him." There cannot be an allusion to the mode of baptism, because, so far as appears, the people were neither immersed nor sprinkled.

The privileges mentioned in this verse and the one following are such as correspond most nearly with the two Christian sacraments. This is the only passage where they are thus brought into juxtaposition. Neander as well as Bengel views the fact as a testimony in favour of the Protestant doctrine that there are only two sacraments.

(K¹) *The Rock was Christ.* Ver. 4.

These words seem specially inserted, Stanley says, in order to impress upon the readers that whatever might be the facts of the history or tradition, the only rock present to the Apostle's mind was the Messiah, just as in the case of "Christ our passover" (ver. 7), for he, in a far higher sense than the *rock* (tzur) at Horeb or the *cliff* (selah) at Kadesh, was the Rock which was always in view with its waters to refresh them at the end no less than at the beginning

of their long wanderings.—The passage not only affirms the pre-existence of our Lord, but identifies Him with the Jehovah of the Old Testament.

(L¹) *A slip of memory.* Ver. 8.

There is no need of assuming any such slip, because Paul's number is a thousand less than Moses's. Hodge remarks, with great force: "Both statements are equally correct." Nothing depended upon the precise number. Any number between the two amounts may, according to common usage, be stated roundly as either the one or the other. The infallibility of the sacred writers consists in their saying precisely what the Spirit of God designed they should say; and the Spirit designed that they should speak after the manner of men, that they should call the heavens round and the earth flat, and use round numbers without intending to be mathematically exact in common speech.

(M¹) "*God is faithful.*" Ver. 13.

The author hardly gives the exact sense of these words. Still less does Stanley, who says that "they express, what we often find in the Psalms, that the faithfulness or justice of God, rather than His mercy, is the sure ground of hope." Alas for the sinner, however penitent, who appeals to justice. Nor is faithfulness = justice. It means, when used in reference to God, His fidelity to His promises. He has engaged that those who are given to His Son shall never perish (John x. 28, 29). This therefore is their security, and not at all any natural firmness of their own, or even the grace infused into them by regeneration.

(N¹) "*Communion.*" Ver. 16.

The word thus rendered (*koinonia*) is often used by Paul. Thus we read of participation of His Son, 1 Cor. i. 9; of the Spirit, 2 Cor. xiii. 13; of the ministry, 2 Cor. viii. 4; of the Gospel, Phil. i. 5; of sufferings, Phil. iii. 5. Of course, the nature of the participation depends on the nature of its object. Here it cannot mean a literal partaking of the substance of Christ's body and blood, since, not to mention other reasons, when the supper was instituted the body of Christ was not yet broken nor His blood shed. It must mean therefore the appropriation of the results of His sacrifice, the appropriation being mediated by this ordinance when there exists faith in the communicant.

(O¹) "*The earth is the Lord's,*" etc. Ver. 26.

This is said by Wetstein to have been the common Jewish form of acknowledgment and thanksgiving before meals, and probably was the early Eucharistic blessing. This fact would give the greater weight to the citation of it as an evidence that nothing is unclean in itself, or can become polluting if used in obedience to the design of its creation.

(P¹) "*Do all to the glory of God.*" Ver. 31.

All the special directions given in the preceding discussion are here summed up. To make the divine glory the governing motive of our lives introduces

order and harmony into all our actions. The sun is then the centre of the system. This secures all other ends (such as our own welfare, the good of others, etc.) by making them subordinate, while at the same time it exalts the soul by placing before it an infinite personal object. Between this and making being in general the end of our actions, there is all the difference that there is between the love of Christ and the love of an abstract idea. The one is religion, the other is morality (Hodge).

CHAPTER XI.

Ver. 2. ἀδελφοί] is wanting in A B C $\aleph$, min. Copt. Sahid. Aeth. Arm. Athan. Cyr. Bas. Chrys. Deleted by Lachm. and Rückert. A natural addition at the beginning of a new section. Comp. x. 1, xii. 1, where not a single authority omits it. Had it been in the original text here, there was no inducement to leave it out. It is otherwise in xv. 31, Rom. xv. 15. — Ver. 5. ἐαυτῆς] αὐτῆς (Lachm.) occurs in A C D * F G L $\aleph$, min. Chrys. Theodoret, *al.* This is such a preponderance of evidence against the *Recepta* (preferred by Tisch. on the authority of B E K Or.), that we must suppose the latter to be an exegetical change for the sake of clearness. — Ver. 7. γυνή] A B D* F G $\aleph$, 73, 118, Dial. Isid. Theodoret read ἡ γυνή, which is adopted by Lachm. Rück. Tisch. Rightly; the article was omitted as in the verse before and after. — Ver. 11. Elz. has the two clauses in inverted order (which Rinck defends), but there is decisive evidence against it. To put the man first seemed more natural. — Ver. 14. ἦ] is wanting in witnesses of decisive authority; deleted by Lach. Rück. Tisch. Added to mark the question. — αὐτῇ ἡ φύσις] A B C D H $\aleph$, min. Damasc. have ἡ φύσις αὐτῇ (so Lachm. and Tisch.); F G Arm. Tert. simply ἡ φύσις. In the absence of grounds of an internal kind, the weight of evidence on the side of ἡ φ. αὐτῇ should make it be preferred. — Ver. 17. παραγγέλλων . . . ἐπαινῶ] Lachm. Rück. Tisch. read παραγγέλλω . . . ἐπαινῶν, on the authority of A B C* F G min. Syr. utr. Arr. Aeth. Arm. Vulg. Clar. Börn. Ambrosiast. Aug. Pel. Bede. This is a preponderance of evidence—all the more that D*, with its reading of παραγγέλλω, οὐκ ἐπαινῶ, must here remain out of account. Then, too, ver. 2 compared with ver. 22 made οὐκ ἐπαινῶ come most naturally to the copyist; so that altogether we must give the preference to Lachmann's reading, which is, besides, the more difficult of the two (against Reiche, who defends the *Recepta*). — Ver. 21. προλαμβάνει] A, 46, *al.* have προσλαμβ. So Rückert. But this is plainly an alteration, because the πρό, *prae*, was not understood. — Ver. 22. ἐπαινέσω] So also Lachm. on the margin (but with ἐπαινῶ in the text) and Tisch., following A C D E K L $\aleph$, all min., several vss. Chrys. Theodoret. The *present* crept in from its occurrence before and after. — Ver. 24. After εἶπε Elz. has λάβετε, φάγετε; but in the face of decisive evidence. Taken from Matt. xxvi. 26. — κλώμενον] omitted in A B C* $\aleph$ *, 17, 67**, Ath. Cyr. Fulg. In D* we have θρυπτόμενον; in Copt. Sahid. Arm. Vulg. *al.*, διδόμενον. Justly suspected by Griesb., and deleted by Lachm. Rück. Tisch. Mere supplements. — Ver. 26. The τοῦτο which stands after ποτήριον in Elz. is condemned by decisive evidence. So, too, the τοῦτον, which Elz. has after ἄρτον in ver. 27, is a later addition. — Ver. 29. ἀναξίως does not occur in A B C $\aleph$ *, 17, Sahid. Aeth.; nor does τοῦ Κυρίου (after σῶμα) in these and some other witnesses. Lachm. and Tisch. delete them both; and both are glosses. What reason was there for omitting them if in the original? — Ver. 31. There is a great preponderance of evidence in favour of δέ instead of γάρ. The latter is an explanatory alteration. — Ver. 34. εἰ] Elz. has εἰ δέ; but there is conclusive evidence for rejecting it.

CONTENTS.—(1) How requisite it is that women cover their heads in the public assemblies for the worship of God,¹ vv. 2–16. (2) Regarding the abuses of the Agapae, and the right way of celebrating them, vv. 17–34.

Ver. 1 belongs still to the preceding section.—Become *imitators* of me. *Become* so, Paul writes, for there was as yet a sad lack of practical evidence of this imitation; see also x. 32 (comp. Kühner, *ad Xen. Anab.* i. 7. 4). — καὶ γὰρ] *as I also have become an imitator*, namely, *of Christ*. Comp. on Matt. xv. 3. Christ as the highest pattern of the spirit described in x. 33. Comp. Phil. ii. 4 ff.; Rom. xv. 3; Eph. v. 2; Matt. xx. 28.

Ver. 2. Conciliatory preamble to the sharp correction which follows. — δέ] is simply the *autem* leading on to a *new* subject; hence we are not to seek any set purpose in the similarity of sound between μιμηταί and μέμνησθε. — πάντα] because you are *in all respects* mindful of me. Rückert's explanation: “you think on *everything that comes from me*” (xvi. 14), is needlessly far-fetched, seeing that μέμνημαι with the accusative, very frequent in Greek writers, does not occur in the N. T., and the absolute πάντα is common enough (ix. 25, x. 32). — καὶ καθὼς κ.τ.λ.] *and because you hold fast the traditions in the way in which I delivered them to you*. This is the practical result of what was stated in the foregoing clause. Παραδόσεις might refer to doctrine as well as to usages and discipline (comp. Gal. i. 14; Col. ii. 8; 2 Thess. ii. 15, iii. 6; Plato, *Legg.* vii. p. 803 A; Polyb. xi. 8. 2); but the tenor of the following context shows that Paul means here directions of the *latter* sort, which he had given to the Corinthians orally (and also perhaps in his lost letter, v. 2). He had, at the foundation of the church and afterwards, made various external regulations, and rejoices that, on the whole, they had not set these aside, but were *holding them fast* in accordance with his directions (κατέχετε, comp. xv. 2; 1 Thess. v. 21; Heb. iii. 6, x. 23). As to the connection of παρέδωκα . . . παραδόσεις, see Winer, p. 210 [E. T. 281].

Ver. 3. “After this general acknowledgment, however, I have still to bid you lay to heart the following particular point.” And now, first of all, the *principle* of the succeeding admonition. Respecting θέλω . . . εἰδέναι, comp. on x. 1; Col. ii. 1. — παντὸς ἀνδρ.] note the prominent position of the word, as also the article before κεφ.: *of every man the Head*. That what is meant, however, is every *Christian* man, is self-evident from this first clause; consequently, Paul is not thinking of the general *order of creation* (Hofmann), according to which Christ is the head of *all things* (Col. i. 16 f., ii. 10), but of the organization of *Christian* fellowship, as it is based upon the *work of redemption*. Comp. Eph. v. 21 ff. — κεφαλῇ, from which we are not (with Hofmann) to dissociate the conception of an organized whole (this would suit in none of the passages where the word occurs, Col. ii. 10 included) designates in all the three cases here the *proximate, immediate Head*, which is to be specially noted in the second instance, for Christ

¹ Much fruitless trouble has been taken to connect even the non-veiling of the women with the state of parties at Corinth. Now it has been the *Pauline party* (Neander),

now the *Christ-party* (Olshausen), and now the *followers of Apollos* (Räbiger), who have been represented as the opponents of veiling.

as head of the church (Col. i. 18 ; Eph. i. 22, iv. 15) is also head of the woman (comp. Eph. v. 22 f.). The relation indicated by κεφ. is that of organic *subordination*, even in the last clause : *He to whom Christ is subordinate is God* (comp. iii. 23, xv. 28, viii. 6 ; Col. i. 15 ; Rom. ix. 5 ; and see Kahnis, *Dogm.* III. p. 208 ff.), where the dogmatic explanation resorted to, that Christ in His *human* nature only is meant (Theodoret, Estius, Calovius, *al.*), is un-Pauline. Neither, again, is His *voluntary subjection* referred to (Billroth), but—which is exactly what the argument demands, and what the two first clauses give us—the *objective* and, notwithstanding His essential equality with God (Phil. ii. 6), *necessary* subordination of the Son to the Father in the divine economy of redemption.¹ Much polemic discussion as to the misuse of this passage by the Arians and others may be found in Chrysostom, Theodoret, and Theophylact. — Gal. iii. 28, indeed, shows that the distinction of the sexes is done away in Christ (in the spiritual sphere of the Christian life) ; but this *ideal* equality of *sex* as little does away with the empirical subordination in marriage as with differences of rank in other earthly relations, *e.g.* of masters and servants. — κεφ. δὲ Χ. ὁ Θεός] The gradation of rank rises up to the *supreme Head over all*, who is the Head of the *man* also, mediately, through Christ. This makes it all the more obvious that, on the one hand, the man who prays or speaks as a prophet before God in the assembly ought not to have his head covered, see ver. 7 ; but that, on the other hand, the relation of the women under discussion is all the more widely to be distinguished from that of the men.

Ver. 4. First inference from the aforesaid gradation of rank.—This inference is a *plea of privilege for the men*, which was but to prepare the way for the censure next to be passed upon the women. Had Paul meant to *correct* the men because they had prayed or preached as prophets at Corinth with their heads covered (Chrysostom and many of the older commentators ; see against this view, Bengel, and especially Storr, *Opusc.* II. p. 283), he would have gone into the matter more in detail, as he does in what follows respecting the women. — προσευχ.] of praying aloud in the public assemblies. For that Paul is giving instructions for the sphere of *church-life*, not for *family worship* (Hofmann), is quite clear from the προφητεύειν added here and in ver. 5, which does not suit the idea of the private devotions of a husband and wife, like the σχολάζειν τῇ προσευχῇ in vii. 5, but always means the *public* use for general edification of the χάρισμα referred to, namely, that of apocalyptic utterance (Acts ii. 17 f., xix. 6, xxi. 9 ; 1 Cor. xiii. and xiv. ; Matt. vii. 22). Moreover, vv. 5 f. and 10 *presuppose publicity* ; as indeed *a priori* we might assume that Paul would not have prescribed so earnestly a specific costume for the head with a view only to the family edification of a man and his wife. It was precisely in the necessity of avoiding

¹ Melanchthon puts it well : “Deus est caput Christi, non de essentia dicitur, sed de ministeriis. Filius mediator accipit ministerium a consilio divinitatis, sicut saepe inquit : Pater misit me. Fit hic mentio non

arcanæ essentiae, sed ministerii.”—Even the exalted and reigning Christ is engaged in this *ministerium*, and finally delivers up the kingdom to the Father. See xv. 28.

public occasion of offence that such precepts could alone find ground enough to justify them ; they were not designed by the liberal-minded apostle to infringe upon the freedom of a woman's dress *at home*. How can any one believe that he meant that when a wife desired, in the retirement of her own house, to pray with her husband (and how often *in a moment* might an occasion for doing so arise !), she must on no account satisfy this religious craving without first of all putting on her περιβόλαιον, and that, if she failed to do so, she stamped herself as a harlot (ver. 5 f.) ! — To take προσευχ. as equivalent to γλώσσαις λαλεῖν (Baur) is not justified by xiv. 13, although speaking with tongues may have occurred in connection with public prayer by women. — προφητ.] See on xii. 10. The force of the *participles* is : Every man, *when* he prays or speaks as a prophet, *while* he has, etc. — κατὰ κεφ. ἔχων] *sc. τί.* See Fritzsche, *Conject.* I. p. 36. Buttmann, *neut. Gr.* p. 127 [E. T. 146]. *Having (something) down from the head*, i.e. *with a head covering*. The Jewish men prayed with the head covered, nay, even with a veil (*Tallith*) before the face. See Lightfoot, *Horae*, p. 210 f. Michaelis, *Anm.* p. 244 f. Hellenic usage again required that the head should be bare on sacred occasions (Grotius on ver. 2 ; Hermann, *gottesd. Alterth.* § 36. 18 f.), while the Romans veiled themselves at sacrifices (Serv. *ad Aen.* iii. 407 ; Dougt. *Anal.* II. p. 116). The *Hellenic* usage had naturally become the prevalent one in the Hellenic churches, and had also commended itself to the discriminating eye of the apostle of the Gentiles as so entirely in accordance with the divinely appointed position of the man (ver. 3), that for the man to cover his head seemed to him to cast dishonour on that position. — καταισχ. τὴν κεφ. αὐτοῦ] So, with the *spiritus lenis*, αὐτοῦ should be written, from the standpoint of the speaker, consequently without any reflex reference (his *own* head), which the context does not suggest. The emphasis of the predicate lies rather on καταισχύνει, as also in ver. 5. Every man, when he prays, etc., *dishonours* his head. *In what respect* he does so, ver. 3 has already clearly indicated, namely (and this meets Baur's objection to the apostle's argument, that the duty of being veiled should attach to the man also from his dependence, ver. 3), inasmuch as he cannot represent any *submission to human authority* by a veil on his head without thereby sacrificing its dignity. His head ought to show to all (and its being uncovered is the sign of this) that no man, but, on the contrary, Christ, and through Him God Himself, is Head (Lord) of the man. We are to understand, therefore, τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ quite simply like κατὰ κεφαλῆς, of the *bodily* head ; ¹ not, with Oecumenius, Theophylact (doubtful), Calvin, Calovius, and others, including Heydenreich, Rückert, de Wette, Osiander, Maier, Hofmann, of *Christ*, which is not required by ver. 3, and is positively forbidden by vv. 5, 6, 14, which take for granted also, as respects the man, the *similar* conception of the κεφαλῇ, namely, in the *literal* sense. This holds also against the double sense which Wolf, Billroth, and Olshausen assume the passage to bear, understanding it to refer to the literal head *and* to Christ as well.

¹ Erasmus, Beza, Grotius, Estius, Bengel, Flatt, Ewald, Neander.

Ver. 5. A second inference of an *opposite* kind from ver. 3, namely, with respect to the *women*. — Prayer and prophetic utterances in meetings on the part of the women are assumed here as allowed. In xiv. 34, on the contrary, *silence* is imposed upon them ; comp. also 1 Tim. ii. 12, where they are forbidden to *teach*. This seeming contradiction between the passages disappears, however, if we take into account that in chap. xiv. it is the *public assembly of the congregation*, the *whole* ἐκκλησία, that is spoken of (vv. 4, 5, 12, 16, 19, 23, 26 ff., 33). There is no sign of such being the case in the passage before us. What the apostle therefore has in his eye here, where he does not forbid the προσεύχεσθαι ἢ προφητεύειν of the women, and at the same time cannot mean *family* worship simply (see on ver. 4), must be *smaller* meetings for devotion in the congregation, more limited circles assembled for worship, such as fall under the category of *a church in the house* (xvi. 19 ; Rom. xvi. 5 ; Col. iv. 15 ; Philem. 2). Since the subject here discussed, as we may infer from its peculiar character, must have been brought under the notice of the apostle for his decision by the Corinthians themselves in their letter, his readers would understand both what kind of meetings were meant as those in which women might pray and speak as prophetesses, and also that the instruction now given was not abrogated again by the “*taceat mulier in ecclesia*.” The latter would, however, be the case, and the teaching of this passage would be aimless and groundless, if Paul were here only *postponing* for a little the prohibition in xiv. 34, in order, first of all, provisionally to censure and correct a mere external abuse in connection with a thing which was yet to be treated as wholly unallowable (against my own former view). It is perfectly arbitrary to say, with Grotius, that in xiv. 34 we must understand as an exception to the rule : “*nisi speciale Dei mandatum habeant*.” — ἀκατακάλυπτω] Polyb. xv. 27. 2. As to the dative, see Winer, p. 203 [E. T. 271]. — τὴν κεφαλ. αὐτῆς] — see the critical remarks — is, like τ. κεφ. αὐτοῦ in ver. 4, to be understood of the *literal* head. A woman when praying was to honour her head by having a sign upon it of the authority of her husband, which was done by having it covered ; otherwise she dishonoured her head by dressing not like a married wife, from whose head-dress one can see that her husband is her head (lord), but like a loose woman, with whose *shorn* head the *uncovered* one is on a par. — ἐν γάρ ἐστι κ.τ.λ.] for she is nothing else, nothing better, than she who is shorn. As the long tresses of the head were counted a womanly adornment among Jews and Gentiles, so the hair shorn off was a sign either of mourning (Deut. xxi. 12 ; Homer, *Od.* iv. 198, xxiv. 46 ; Eurip. *Or.* 458 ; Hermann, *Privatalterth.* § xxxix. 28) or of shamelessness (Elsner, *Obs.* p. 113), and was even the penalty of an adulteress (Wetstein *in loc.*). What Paul means to say then is: a woman praying with uncovered head stands in the eye of public opinion, guided as it is by appearances, on just the same level with her who has the shorn hair of a courtesan. — ἐν κ. τὸ αὐτό] emphatic: *unum idemque*. See instances in Kypke, II. p. 220. The subject to this is πᾶσα γυνὴ κ.τ.λ., not the appearing uncovered, so that strictly it ought to have been τῇ ἐξυπῆσθαι (Billroth). And the *neuter* is used, because the subject is regarded as a general conception. Comp. iii. 8. Respecting the dative, see Kühner,

II. p. 244; Kruger, § xlvi. 14. 9. — The form *ξυράω* has less authority in Attic writers than *ξυρέω*. See Lobeck, *ad Phryn.* p. 205.

REMARK.—The evil, which Paul here rebukes with such sharpness and decision, must have broken out after the apostle had left Corinth; had he been present, he would not have allowed it to emerge. It arose probably from an unseemly extension of the principle of Christian liberty, occasioned by the fact of women partaking in the special gifts of the Spirit, ver. 4, and doubtless under the influence of the greater laxity of Hellenic ideas about female dress. The letter from the Corinthians, when referring to the way in which the apostle's instructions were acted upon at Corinth (ver. 2), must have contained an inquiry put to him upon this particular point (comp. on ver. 5). The fact that Paul makes no allusion to *virgins* here proves that they were not involved in the wrong practice, although Tertullian (*de virginib. veland.*) unwarrantably applies our passage to them also.

Ver. 6 gives the ground of *ἐν ἐστὶ κ.τ.λ.*, ver. 5. That ground is, that the step from not being covered to being shorn is only what *consistency demands*, while the dishonour again implied in being shorn requires that the woman should be covered; consequently, to be uncovered lies by no means midway between being shorn and being covered as a thing indifferent, but falls under the same moral category as being shorn. *For when a woman puts on no covering, when she has once become so shameless, then she should have herself shorn too* (in addition). A demand for *logical consistency* (Winer, p. 292 [E. T. 391]) serving only to make them feel the *absurdity* of this unseemly emancipation from restraint in public prayer and speaking (for ver. 5 shows that these rules cannot be *general* ones, against Hofmann). To understand it simply as a *permission*, does not suit the conclusion; comp. on the contrary *κατακαλυπτέσθω*. — τὸ κείρ. ἢ ξυράσθαι] “Plus est radi (ξυρ.) quam tonderi,” Grotius. Comp. Valckenaer. *Ξυρ.* means *to shave*, with the razor (*ξυρόν*). The two words occur together in Mic. i. 16, LXX. Note the absence of any repetition of the article in connection with the double description of the one unseemly thing.

Vv. 7–9. Γάρ] introduces the grounding of the *κατακαλυπτέσθω*, consequently a *second* ground for the proposition under discussion (the first being vv. 3–6). The argument sets out again (comp. ver. 3) *e contrario*. — οὐκ ὀφείλει] does not mean: *he is not bound*, which, as ver. 3 shows, would not be enough; but: *he ought not*, etc., in contrast to the woman who *ought* (vv. 5, 10). Comp. 2 Cor. xii. 14. — εἰκὼν κ. δόξα κ.τ.λ.] The obligation to pray, etc., with the head covered would be inconsistent with this high dignity, because to cover the head is a sign of submission to human power, ver. 10. A man as such (*ἀνὴρ*) is the *image of God* (Gen. i. 26 f.), inasmuch as he, being Adam's representative, has dominion over the earth. Other elements of what constitutes the image of God are not, according to the context, taken into account here, nor are the ecclesiastical definitions of it. He is also *the glory of God*, inasmuch as, being the image of God, he, in his appearance as man, practically represents on earth in a human way the majesty of God as a ruler. Rückert, following older interpreters (given in Wolf), holds that

δόξα is meant here as the rendering of דְמוּת, Gen. i. 26; as also the LXX., in Num. xii. 8, Ps. xvii. 15, translates תְּמוּנָה by *δόξα*. But had Paul *wished* to convey the meaning of דְמוּת, a passage so important and so familiar as Gen. i. 26 would certainly have suggested to him the word used there by the LXX., ὁμοίωσις. *Δόξα* corresponds simply to the Hebrew כְּבוֹד. — Paul describes only *the man* as being the image and *δόξα* of God; for he has in his eye the relation of *marriage*, in which rule is conferred on the *man* alone. The woman accordingly has, in harmony with the whole connection of the passage, to appear simply as *δόξα ἀνδρός*, inasmuch, namely, as her whole wedded dignity, the high position of being spouse of the man, proceeds from the man and is held in obedience to him; so that the woman does not carry an independent glory of her own, an *ιδία δόξα*, but the majesty of the *man* reflects itself in her, passing over to her mediately and, as it were, by derivation. (Q¹) Grotius compares her happily to the moon as “lumen minus sole.” This exposition of *δόξα ἀνδρός* is the only one which suits the context, and corresponds in conception to the preceding *δόξα Θεοῦ*, without at the same time anticipating what is next said in vv. 8, 9. The conception of the *δόξα*, which is Θεοῦ in case of the man and ἀνδρός in that of the woman, is determined by the idea of the *ordo conjugalis*, not by that of *humanity* (Hofmann) originally realized in the man but passing thence into a derivative realization in the woman. — Paul omits εἰκὼν in the woman's case, not because he refused to recognize the divine image in her (except in an *immediate* sense), but because he felt rightly that, in view of the distinction of sex, the word would be unsuitable (comp. de Wette), and would also convey too much, considering the subordinate position of the woman in marriage. — Ver. 8. *For there is not* such a thing as *man from woman*, etc., but the relation of the two as respects being in the converse. — Ver. 9. The γάρ here is *subordinate* to that in ver. 8: “*for there was not created* a man for the woman's sake, but conversely.” This is the concrete historical establishment, from the *narrative* of their *creation*, of the relation between the two sexes, which had been generally stated in ver. 8; in giving it, Paul, with Gen. ii. 18 in his view, does not bring in ἐκ again, but διὰ, which, however, considering how familiar the history was, throws no doubt upon the genuineness of the ἐκ. In καὶ γάρ the καί (which has the force of *even indeed*, Hartung, I. p. 135) belongs to οὐκ ἐκτίσθη. The present genetic relation of the two sexes, ver. 8, began as early as the creation of the first pair. (R¹)

Ver. 10. Διὰ τοῦτο] namely, because the relation of the woman to the man is such as has been indicated in vv. 7–9. — ἐξουσίαν ἔχειν ἐπὶ τῆς κεφ.] *to have a power*, i.e. *the sign of a power* (to wit, as the context shows, *of her husband's power*, under which she stands), *upon her head*; by which the apostle means *a covering for the head*.¹ So Chrysostom,² Theodoret, Oecumenius, Theophylact, with the majority both of ancient and modern commentators, including

¹ Luther's gloss is: “That is the veil or covering, by which one may see that she is under her husband's authority, Gen. iii. 16.”

² Ἄρα τὸ καλύπτεσθαι ὑποταγῆς καὶ ἐξουσίας.

And on ver. 7 he says: As the man ought to pray uncovered in token of his ἀρχή, so for the woman it is a mark of presumption τὸ μὴ ἔχειν τὰ σύμβολα τῆς ὑποταγῆς.

van Hengel, *Annot.* p. 175 ff.; Lücke in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1828, p. 571 f., Billroth, Rückert, Olshausen, de Wette, Osiander, Ewald, Neander, Maier, Weiss, Vilmar in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1864, p. 465 f.; comp. Düsterdieck in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1863, p. 707 ff. Just as in Diodor. Sic. i. 47, in the phrase *ἔχουσιν τρεῖς βασιλείας ἐπὶ τῆς κεφ.*, the *context* shows beyond a doubt that *βασ.* means symbols of *one's own* power (diadems), so here the *connection* justifies the use of *ἐξουσία* to denote the sign of *another's* power; the phrase thus simply having its proper reference brought out, and by no means being twisted into an opposite meaning, as Hofmann objects. Comp. also the ornaments of the Egyptian priests, which, as being symbols of truth, bore the name of *ἀλήθεια*, Diod. Sic. i. 48. 77; Ael. V. H. xiv. 34. Schleusner explains *ἐξουσ.* as a *token of the honour* (of the married women over the single). But both the context (ver. 9) and the literal meaning of *ἐξουσία* are against this. Bengel and Schrader make it a sign of *authority* to speak in public. But the whole connection points to the authority of the husband over the wife. There is not a word in the whole passage about the *potestas orandi*, etc., nor of its being granted by the *husband* (Schrader). Hagenbach's view (*Stud. u. Krit.* 1828, p. 401) is also contrary to the context, seeing that we have previously *διὰ τὸν ἄνδρα*; he understands *ἐξουσία* as a *mark of descent*. Paul, he holds, formed the word upon the analogy of *παρουσία* κ.τ.λ.,—a view that does not even leave to the term its lexical meaning, which was surely familiar enough to the apostle and his readers. Other expositors make *ἐξουσία* *directly* to signify a *veil* (Michaelis, Schulz), to establish which they have appealed in the most arbitrary way to the help of Hebrew words (Cappellus, Clericus, Hammond, Semler, Ernesti). Hitzig again, in the *theol. Jahrb.* 1854, p. 129 ff., gives out the term to be a *Jewish-Greek* one, derived from *ἐξ ἴσου*; because the veil had, he maintains, two overhanging halves which balanced each other, in front and behind. But what is fatal to every attempt of this kind is that *ἐξουσία*, *power*, is so very *familiar* a word, and suits perfectly well here in this its ordinary sense, while, as the name of a veil, it would be entirely without trace and without analogy in Greek. As for the derivation from *ἐξ ἴσου*, that is simply an etymological impossibility. Other interpreters still assume that *ἐξουσ.* means here not a *sign* of power, but *power itself*. So, in various preposterous ways, earlier commentators cited by Wolf; and so more recently Kypke and Pott. The former puts a comma after *ἐξουσία*, and explains the clause: "*propterea mulier potestati obnoxia est, ita ut velamen (comp. ver. 4) in capite habeat.*" But the sense of *ὀφείλειν τι* would rather have required *ὑπακοήν* in place of *ἐξουσίαν*. Pott again (in the *Götting. Weihnachtsprogr.* 1831, p. 22 ff.) renders it: "*mulierem oportet servare jus seu potestatem in caput suum, sc. eo, quod illud velo obtegit.*" Not inconsistent with linguistic usage (Rev. xi. 6, xx. 6, xiv. 18; comp. Luke xix. 17), but all the more so with the context, since what ver. 9 states is just that the woman has *no* power at all over herself, and *for that very reason* ought to wear a veil. Hofmann, too, rejects the symbolical explanation of *ἐξουσία*, and finds the metaphorical element simply in the local import of the phrase *ἐπὶ κεφαλῇς* (comparing it with such passages as Acts xviii. 6, where, however, the idea is wholly different

in kind). He makes the thought to be : the woman must have a power upon or over her head, because she must be subject to such a power. In that case what would be meant would be her husband's power, which she must have over her. But the question in hand was not at all about anything so general and self-evident as that, but about the *veiling*, which she was bound to observe. The *conjectural* interpretations which have been attempted are so far-fetched as not to deserve further mention. We may add that there is no evidence in antiquity for the *symbolism* which Paul here connects with the veiling of the women in assemblies (the hints which Baur founds upon in the *theol. Jahrb.* 1852, p. 571 ff., are too remote). We have the more reason, therefore, to agree with Lücke in ascribing it to the ingenious apostle himself, however old the custom itself—that married women should wear veils in public—was in Hebrew usage (Ewald, *Alterth.* p. 269 f.). — *διὰ τοὺς ἀγγέλους*] which Baur uncritically holds to be a gloss—a view to which Neander also was inclined—is not a *formula obsecrandi* (Heydenreich, who, with Vorstius, Hammond, Bengel, and Zachariae, strangely assumes a reference to Isa. vi. 2), but a clause adding to the *inner* ground (*διὰ τοῦτο*) an *outward* one : “for the sake of the angels,” *in order to avoid exciting disapproval among them.*¹ *Τοὺς ἀγγέλους αἰδέσθητι*, Chrysostom. Erasmus puts it well in his *Paraphrase* : “Quodsi mulier eo venit impudentiae, ut testes hominum oculos non vereatur, saltem ob angelos testes, qui vestris conventibus intersunt, caput operiat.” That the holy angels are present at assemblies for worship, is an idea which Paul had retained from *Judaism* (LXX. Ps. cxxxviii. 1 ; Tob. xii. 12 f. ; Buxtorf, *Synag.* 15, p. 306 ; Grotius *in loc.* ; Eisenmenger, *entdeckt. Judenth.* II. p. 393), and made an element in his *Christian* conception,² in accordance with the ministering destination ascribed to them in Heb. i. 14, but without any of the Jewish elaborations. It must remain a very doubtful point whether he had *guardian angels* (Acts xii. 15 ; Matt. xviii. 10) specially in view (Jerome, August. *de Trin.* xii. 7 ; Theodoret, comp. Theophylact), seeing that he nowhere says anything definite about them. Other expositors make the reference to be to the *bad* angels, who would be incited to wantonness by the unveiled women (Tert. *c. Marc.* v. 8 ; *de virg. vel.* 7, *al.*),³ or might incite the men to it (Schoettgen, Zeltner, Mosheim), or might do harm to the uncovered women (Wetstein, Semler). Others, again, understand it to

¹ [So Hodge, Lange's Com., Stanley, Princ. Brown, Speaker's Com., Ellicott's Com., and Beet.—T. W. C.]

² Since the apostle is speaking of meetings for worship, it is unsuitable to make the reference be to the angels *as witnesses of the creation of the first pair* ; so van Hengel, *Annot.* p. 181 f., following a Schol. in Matthiae. Any allusion to Gen. vi. 1-4 (suggested already by Tertullian, *al.* Comp. also Kurtz, *d. Ehen d. Söhne Gottes*, p. 177, and Hofmann) is wholly foreign to the passage. Hofmann imports into it the idea : “that the spirits which have sway in the corporeal world might be tempted to enter into

that relation to the woman which is assigned to her husband.” Hilgenfeld too, in his *Zeitschr.* 1864, p. 183, makes it refer to the story in the Book of Enoch, 5 f., about the transgression of the angels with the daughters of men. What an importing of carnal lust ! And were not the women whom the apostle here warns *in part* matrons and gray-headed dames !

³ *Test. XII. Patr.* p. 529 should not be aduced here (against Bretschneider). The passage contains a warning against the vanity of head-ornament, the seductive character of which is proved by an argument *a majori ad minus*.

mean *pious men* (Clem. Alex.), or the Christian *prophets* (Beza), or *those presiding in the congregation* (Ambrosiaster), or *those deputed to bring about betrothals* (Lightfoot), or unfriendly *spies* (Heumann, Alethius, Schulz, Morus, Storr, Stolz, Rosenmüller, Flatt, Schrader)—all mere attempts at explanation, which are sufficiently disposed of by the single fact that *ἄγγελοι*, when standing *absolutely* in the N. T., *always* denotes *good angels* alone. See on iv. 9. The correct exposition is given also by Düsterdieck, *l.c.*, who shows well the fine trait of apostolic mysticism in *διὰ τοὺς ἄγγέλους*.

Ver. 11. Paul's teaching from ver. 7 onward might possibly be misinterpreted by the men, so as to lead them to despise the women, and by the women so as to underrate their own position. Hence the caveat which now follows (*ἐπάγει τὴν διόρθωσιν*, Chrys.) against the possible dislocation of the *Christian* relation of the two sexes : *nevertheless, neither is the woman without the man, nor the man without the woman in Christ, i.e. nevertheless there subsists such a relation between the two in the sphere of the Christian life (ἐν Κυρίῳ), that neither does the woman stand severed from the man, i.e. independent of, and without bond of fellowship with, him, nor vice versâ.* They are united as Christian spouses (comp. ver. 3) in mutual dependence, each belonging to the other and supplying what the other lacks ; neither of the parties being a separate independent person. The *ἐν Κυρίῳ* thus assigns to the relation here expressed the distinctive sphere, in which it subsists. Out of Christ, in a profane marriage of this world, the case would be different. Were we, with Storr, Heydenreich, Rückert, Hofmann, to take *ἐν Κυρίῳ* as predicative definition : "neither does the woman stand in connection with Christ without the man, nor *vice versâ*," this would resolve itself either into the meaning given by Grotius : "Dominus neque viros exclusis feminis, neque feminas exclusis viris redemit ;" or into Hofmann's interpretation, that in a Christian marriage the relation to the Lord is a common one, shared in by the two parties alike. But both of these ideas are far too obvious, general, and commonplace to suit the context. Olshausen (comp. Beza) renders it, "*by the arrangement of God.*" But *ἐν Κυρίῳ* is the *statedly used* term for *Christ* ; the reference to the *divine* arrangement comes in afterwards in ver. 12.

Ver. 12. *For, were this not the case, the Christian system would be clearly at variance with the divine arrangement in nature.* This against Rückert, who accuses ver. 12 of lending no probative support to ver. 11. — *ἡ γυνὴ ἐκ τοῦ ἀνδρ.] sc. ἐστὶ*, namely, in respect of *origination at first*. Comp. ver. 8. — *ὁ ἀνὴρ διὰ τῆς γυν.]* in respect of *origination now*. 'Εκ denotes the direct origination in the way known to all his readers from the history of woman's creation in Gen. ii. 21 f. ; *διὰ* again the mediate origin by birth, all men being *γεννητοὶ γυναικῶν*, Matt. xi. 11 ; Gal. iv. 4. Paul might have repeated the *ἐκ* in the second clause also (Matt. i. 16 ; Gal. iv. 4), but he wished to mark the difference between the first and the continued creation. And in order to bring out the sacred character of the moral obligation involved in this genetic relation of mutual dependence, he adds : *τὰ δὲ πάντα ἐκ τ. Θεοῦ* : *now all this, that we have been treating of ("vir, mulier et alterius utrius mutua ab altero dependentia," Bengel), is from God, proceeding from and*

ordered by Him. As regards *this* ἐκ, comp. 2 Cor. v. 18 ; 1 Cor. viii. 6 ; Rom. xi. 36.

Vv. 13-15. By way of appendix to the discussion, the apostle refers his readers—as regards especially the *praying* of the women, which had given rise to debate—to *the voice of nature herself*. He asks them : Is it seemly, —judge within yourselves concerning it,—is it seemly that a woman should offer up prayers uncovered ? Does not *nature herself* even (οὐδέ) teach you the opposite ? —ἐν ὑμῖν αὐτοῖς] without any influence from without ; comp. x. 15. —τῷ Θεῷ] superfluous in itself, but added for the sake of *emphasis*, in order to impress upon them the more deeply the unseemliness of the uncovered state in which the woman comes forward to deal *with the Most High* in prayer. —Regarding the different constructions with πρέπον ἐστι, see Buttmann, *neut. Gr.* p. 239 [E. T. 278].—The φύσις is the natural relation of the judgment and feeling to the matter in question,—the native, inborn sense and perception of what is seemly. This instinctive consciousness of propriety had been, as respected the point in hand, established by *custom* and had *become* φύσις. Comp. Chrysostom. The manifold discussions, to little purpose, by the old commentators regarding the meaning of φύσις, may be seen in Poole's *Synopsis*, and in Wolf. It is here, as often in Greek writers (comp. also Rom. ii. 14), the contrast to education, law, art, and the like. It cannot in this passage mean, as Hofmann would have it, the *arrangement of things in conformity with their creation*—that is to say, the *arrangement* of nature in the *objective* sense (so, frequently in the classics), for the assertion that *this* teaches all that is expressed by the ὅτι ἀνὴρ κ.τ.λ. would go much too far and be unwarranted. Were we, again, to assume that ὅτι does not depend at all on διδάσκει, but gives the *ground* for the question, so that διδάσκει would require its contents to be *supplied* out of the first half of the verse, how awkwardly would Paul have expressed himself, and how liable must he have been to misapprehension, in putting ὅτι instead of conveying his meaning with clearness and precision by γάρ ! And even apart from this objection as to the form of expression, we cannot surely suppose that the apostle would find in a fact of aesthetic custom (vv. 14, 15)—that is to say, a something in its own nature accidental, and subsisting as an actual fact only for the man accustomed to it—the confirmation of what the *order of things in conformity with their creation* teaches. (s¹) —αὐτῇ] independently of all other instruction.—Upon the matter itself (κόμην δὲ ἔχειν καὶ εὐκομον εἶναι γυναικώτερον ἐστι, Eustath. *ad Il.* iii. p. 288), see Perizonius, *ad Ael. V. H.* ix. 4 ; Wetstein *in loc.* In *ancient* times, among the Hellenes, the luxuriant, carefully-tended hair of the head was the mark of a free man (see generally, Hermann, *Privatalterth.* § xxiii. 13 ff.). Comp. also 2 Sam. xiv. 25 f. In the church, both by councils and popes, the κομοτροφεῖν was repeatedly and strictly forbidden to the clergy.¹ See *Decretal. lib. iii. tit.*

¹ If we are to look upon the tonsure, however, as a symbol of the spiritual life in contradistinction to the vanities of this world (see Walter, *Kirchenr.* § 212), then this by no means corresponds to the view

held by the apostle in our text. Long hair on the head is a disgrace to a man in his eyes ; because he regards it as a sign of human subjection.

i. cap. 4. 5. 7. — ὅτι ἡ κόμη ἀντὶ περιβ. δέδ.] Ground for long hair being an ornament to a woman : *because it is given to her instead of a veil*, to take its place, to be, as it were, a natural veil. This again implies that to wear a veil, as in the case in hand, is a decorous thing. For if the κόμη is an honour for a woman *because it is given to her in place of a veil*, then *the veil itself* too must be an honour to her, and to lay it aside in prayer a disgrace. “*Naturae debet respondere voluntas*,” Bengel. Περιβόλαιον, *something thrown round one*, a covering in general (see the Lexicons, and Schleusner, *Theo.* IV. p. 289), has here a special reference to the veil (καλύπτρα, κάλυμμα) spoken of in the context.

Ver. 16. The apostle has done with the subject ; but one word more of warning now against all controversy about it.—δοκεῖ] Vulg. : “*si quis autem videtur contentiosus esse*.” This would imply that sort of *forbearing courtesy* in the δοκεῖ, according to which one “*videri aliquid esse, quam vere esse dicere maluit*,” Fritzsche, *ad Matth.* p. 129. Comp. Frotscher, *ad Xen. Hier.* p. 92. Sturz, *Lex. Xen.* I. p. 757 f. So de Wette and Winer, p. 570 [E. T. 766]. But one can see no reason for Paul’s choosing any such special delicacy of phrase. If, again, we understand the words to mean : if any one *likes to be*, or *has pleasure in being*, contentious (Luther, Grotius, Rückert), that is to confound the expression with the construction δοκεῖ μοι.¹ The simplest explanation, and, at the same time, quite literally faithful, is, as in Matt. iii. 9, Phil. iii. 4 : if any one *is of opinion*, if he *thinks*, or *is minded to be*, etc. ; but to import the notion of *permission* into the infinitive here, in connection with this rendering (Billroth), would be arbitrary, because without warrant from the text (Kühner, *ad Xen. Mem.* ii. 1. 1). — ἡμεῖς τοιαύτην κ.τ.λ.] declarative : *Let him be told that we*, etc. Comp. Rom. xi. 18. See Winer, p. 575 [E. T. 773]. — ἡμεῖς] *I and those who are like minded with me*. — τοιαύτην συνήθ.] *such a custom*. Interpreters refer this either to the censured practice of *the women being unveiled* (Theodoret, Erasmus, Grotius, Bengel, Michaelis, Semler, Rosenmüller, Heydenreich, Flatt, Billroth, Olshausen, Ewald, Neander, Maier, Hofmann), or to the *custom of contention* (Chrysostom, Ambrosiaster, Beza, Calvin, Piscator, Estius, Calovius, and others, including Rückert and de Wette). The latter suits the immediate context, and is *required* by ἡμεῖς ; hence we cannot, with Theophylact and Osiander, leave it an open question which of the two references should be preferred. The οὐδὲ αἱ ἐκκλ. τ. Θεοῦ is not against this view ; for what is asserted is not that all individual members were free from the love of strife, but only that the *churches* as a whole were so. These last are distinguished by οὐδὲ αἱ ἐκκλ. τ. Θεοῦ from the *individuals* implied in ἡμεῖς. Neither does the expression συνήθεια throw any difficulty in the way of our interpretation ; on the contrary, occurring as it does in this short concluding sentence of deprecation, it lends to it a certain *point* against the readers, some of whom seem to have allowed this vice of contentiousness to grow with them into a *habit* ; it was their miserable *custom* ! (τ') — The

¹ So, too, δοκῶ μοι, *lubet, volo*. See Ast, *ad Plat. Phaed.* p. 251. Also δέδοκται μοι. See Ast, *Lex. Plat.* I. p. 552.

abnormal position of isolation, into which their controversial tendencies would bring them, should surely suffice to prevent their indulging them !

Ver. 17. Transition to the censure which follows. *Now this* (what I have written up to this point about the veiling of the women) *I enjoin*,¹ *while I do not praise* (i.e. while I join with my injunction the censure), *that ye*, etc. The "litotes" οὐκ ἐπαινῶν glances back upon ver. 2. Lachmann's view, according to which the new section begins at ver. 16, so that φιλόνηκος would relate to the σχίσματα in ver. 18, has this against it, that παραγγέλλω always means *praecipio* in the N. T. (vii. 10 ; 1 Thess. iv. 11 ; 2 Thess. iii. 4, 6, 10, 12, *al.*), not *I announce*, and that no injunction is expressed in ver. 16. Moreover, we should desiderate some conclusion to the foregoing section, and, as such, considering especially that the matter in question was such a purely external one, ver. 16 comes in with peculiar appropriateness. Other expositors, such as Lyra, Erasmus, Piscator, Grotius, Calovius, Hammond, Bengel, Rückert, also Ewald and Hofmann (comp. his *Schriftbeweis*, II. 2, p. 235 f.), refer τοῦτο, after the example of the Greek Fathers, to what *follows*, inasmuch, namely, as the exposition now to begin ends in a *command*, and shows the reason why the church deserves *no praise* in this aspect of its church-life. Paul has already in his mind, according to these interpreters, the directions which he is about to give, but lays a foundation for them first of all by censuring the disorders which had crept in. Upon that view, however, the τοῦτο παραγγ. would come in much too soon ; and we must suppose the apostle, at the very beginning of an important section, so little master of his own course of thought, as himself to throw his readers into confusion by leaving them without anything at all answering to the τοῦτο παραγγ. — ὅτι οὐκ εἰς τὸ κρεῖττον κ.τ.λ.] does not give the *reason* of his not praising, but—seeing there is no ὑμᾶς with ἐπαιν., as in ver. 2—states *what it is* that he cannot praise. Your coming together is of such a kind that not the *melius* but the *pejus* arises out of it as its result ; that it becomes worse instead of better with you (with your Christian condition). Theophylact and Billroth make τὸ κρεῖττ. and τὸ ἥττον refer to *the assemblies themselves* : "that you hold your assemblies in such a way that they become worse instead of better." A tame idea !

Vv. 18, 19. Πρῶτον μὲν γάρ] The second point is found by *most* expositors in ver. 20 (so Billroth, Rückert, Olshausen, de Wette, Ewald, Maier, Winer, p. 536 [E. T. 721]). In that case Paul first of all censures here generally the divisions which appeared in their assemblies, and then in ver. 20 links on by οὖν the abuse of the Lord's Supper as a consequence of those divisions. But this view has against it the fact that he follows up ver. 18 neither by censure nor correction of what was amiss, which he would not have omitted to do, considering the importance of the matter in question, if he had regarded ver. 18 as touching upon a distinct point from that in vv. 20, 21. Moreover, in ver. 22, ἐπαινέσω ὑμᾶς ; ἐν τούτῳ οὐκ ἐπαινῶ, which has reference

¹ Hofmann irrelevantly objects to our making τοῦτο refer to the preceding passage, that Paul has previously *enjoined* nothing. He has, in fact, very *categorically*

enjoined that the women should be veiled (comp. esp. vv. 5, 6, 10), and not simply expressed his opinion upon a custom that displeased him.

to the οὐκ ἐπαινῶν of ver. 17, proves that in his mind vv. 18–22 formed not two rebukes, but one. This serves, too, by way of reply to Hofmann, who insists on taking πρῶτον, in spite of the μέν that follows it, not as *first*, but as *before all things, above all*. The true view, on the contrary, is (comp. also Baur in the *theol. Jahrbücher*, 1852, p. 558 ; Rübiger, p. 135 ; Osiander), that οὖν in ver. 20 does not introduce a second point of reprehension, but takes up again the first point, which had been begun in ver. 18 and interrupted by καὶ μέρος τι κ.τ.λ. (see on viii. 4),—an interpretation which is strongly supported by the repetition of the same words συνερχομ. ὑμῶν. In using the term σχίσματα,¹ Paul has already in his mind the separations *at the love-feasts* (not the party divisions of i. 12, Theodore, and many others), but is kept for a time from explaining himself more fully by the digression which follows, and does so only in ver. 20. Still, however, the question remains : *Where is the second point, which πρῶτον leads us to expect?* It commences in xii. 1. Paul censures two kinds of evils in connection with their assemblies—(1) the degeneration of the Agapae (vv. 18–34), and (2) the misapplication of the gifts of the Spirit (xii. 1 ff.). The πρῶτον μέν is left out of account while he pursues the first point, and instead of following it up with an ἐπειτα δέ, after completing his discussion, he passes on in xii. 1 with the continuative δέ to second subject, making no further reference to that πρῶτον μέν γάρ in ver. 18. How common it is in classic writers also to find the πρῶτον followed by no ἐπειτα, or anything of the kind, but another turn given to the sentence, may be seen in Maetzner, *ad Antiph.* p. 191 ; Bremi, *ad Lys.* I. p. 31. Comp. on Acts i. 1, and on Rom. i. 8, iii. 2. — ἐν ἐκκλ.] *in a church-meeting*. This is conceived of as a *local sphere* (comp. Bengel : “*vergit ad significationem loci*”), in which the συνέρχεσθαι takes place by the arrival of members ; as we also say : “in einer Gesellschaft zusammenkommen.” Comp. Winer, p. 386 [E. T. 515]. Although the apostle might have written εἰς ἐκκλησίαν (Lucian, *Jov. Trag.* 6), yet we must neither take ἐν in the sense of εἰς (Vulgate, Rückert, Schrader), nor impute to the word ἐκκλ. the meaning : *place of assembly* (Grotius, Wolf, Heydenreich), nor understand it adverbially, as with abstract terms : *congregationally* (Hofmann). — There should be no comma after ἐκκλ. ; for συνέρχ. κ.τ.λ. connects itself in meaning not with ἀκούω, but with σχίσματα κ.τ.λ. — ἀκούω] in the sense of ἀκήκοα, denoting continuance. See Ast, *ad Plat. Leg.* p. 9 f. ; Bernhardt, p. 370 ; Kühner, *ad Xen. Mem.* iii. 5. 26. — μέρος τι] *for a part, partly*, Thuc. i. 23. 3, ii. 64. 2, iv. 30. 1 ; Isocr. p. 426 D. He cannot bring himself to believe *all* that he has heard of the divisions at their assemblies. A delicate way of showing the better opinion that he still has of his readers, not a reference to the uncertainty of the source whence the news reached him (Hofmann). — δεῖ] according to God's decree. It is the “*necessitas consequentiae*” (Melancthon) ; for the ἵνα which follows indicates, according to the apostle's teleological view (comp. Matt. xviii. 7), the end ordained by God, namely, that the *tried*, those who have not

¹ Chrysostom well remarks : οὐ λέγει· ἀκούω μὴ κοινῇ ὑμᾶς συνδειπνεῖν, ἀκούω γὰρ κατ' ἰδίαν ὑμᾶς ἐστιᾶσθαι καὶ μὴ μετὰ τῶν πενήτων ἀλλ' ὁ

μάλιστα ἱκανὸν ἦν αὐτῶν διασεῖσαι τὴν διάνοιαν, τοῦτο τέθεικε τὸ τοῦ σχίσματος ὄνομα, ὃ καὶ τοῦτου ἦν αἴτιον.

suffered themselves to be carried away by party-agitation, *should become manifest*. (v¹) — καὶ αἰρέσεις] It cannot be proved (although Rückert, Neander, Hofmann, and others hold) that αἰρέσεις is something *worse*¹ than σχίσματα (and that καὶ must mean *even*), as Pelagius, Estius, and Calovius would take it ; for καὶ may be simply *also* (among other evils *also*), and in Gal. v. 20—where, moreover, σχίσματα does not come in at all—Paul does not intend to construct an exact climax, but merely to *heap together* kindred things. Now, seeing that our Epistle says nothing of absolute party-separations, but always shows us merely party-divisions subsisting along with outward unity, one cannot well make out *wherein* the worseness of the αἰρέσεις consisted ; for to hold, with Rückert, that εἶναι means to *ensue*, and points to the *future* (as Hofmann too maintains), is a perfectly groundless assumption. The αἰρέσεις *were there*, were not merely *coming* ; it will not do to confound εἶναι with γίνεσθαι or ἐλθεῖν (Matt. xviii. 7 ; Luke xvii. 1), a mistake into which J. Müller also falls, *l.c.* We must therefore, with Chrysostom, Grotius, Olshausen, *al.*, regard αἰρέσεις as another form of designation for the same thing (the σχίσματα). It does not mean *heresies* in the sense of *false doctrine* (2 Pet. ii. 1), as Calvin, Calovius, and others maintain ; neither does it refer simply to the separations in keeping the Agapae (Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Theophylact) ; but—as is clear from the nature of the sentence as assigning a more general reason for what had been said—to *factionous divisions in the church generally*² (according as there existed tendencies and views at variance with each other and destructive of harmony). Comp. on Gal. v. 20.

Ver. 20. Οὖν] resuming after the parenthesis ; see on ver. 18. — ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό] *to the same place*. See on Acts i. 15. — οὐκ ἔστι κυριακ. δεῖπν. φαγ.] *there does not take place an eating of a Lord's Supper*, i.e. *one cannot eat a Lord's Supper in that way* ; it is morally *impossible*, since things go on in such fashion as ver. 21 thereupon specifies by way of proof. We have here the very common and familiar use of ἔστι with the infinitive, in the sense of : *it is possible, one can*, as in Heb. ix. 5. So *e.g.* the passages from Plato given by Ast, *Lex.* I. p. 622 ; Hom. *il.* xxi. 193, *al.* ; Thuc. viii. 53 ; Soph. *Phil.* 69 ; Aesch. *Pers.* 414 ; Polyb. i. 12. 9, v. 98. 4. It occurs in the classics also for the most part with the negative. See generally, Valckenaer on Eurip. *Hippol.* 1326. Beza, Estius, Zachariae, de Wette, Ewald, Maier, Winer, *al.*, render it otherwise, as if there were a τοῦτο in the text : *this is not*, etc. And even if there were such a τοῦτο, it would have nothing here to connect itself with. — κυριακὸν δεῖπνον] *a meal belonging to the Lord*, consecrated to Christ ; comp. ver. 27, x. 21. The name was given to the *love-feasts* (Agapae, Jude 12), at which the Christians ate and drank together what they severally brought with them, and with which was conjoined the Lord's Supper properly so called (x. 16, 21 ; comp. on Acts ii. 42), so that

¹ So also J. Müller, *v. d. Sünde*, I. p. 538, ed. 5, holds that σχίσμ. denotes the *inner disunion* in the church, which shows itself in *positive division and faction* (αἰρέσεις). Wetstein, on the contrary, considered

αἵρεσις a "*mollius vocabulum*" than σχίσμα.

² It is arbitrary to ascribe the disturbance about the Lord's Supper to one special party at Corinth, such as the Christ-party (Olshausen), or that of Apollos (Räbiger).

the bread was distributed and partaken of *during* the meal and the cup *after* it, according to the precedent of the original institution. Comp. Tertullian, *Apol.* 30. Chrysostom, indeed, and Pelagius held that Lord's Supper *came first*; but this is contrary to the model of the first institution, came into vogue only at a later date, and rests purely upon the ascetic idea that it was unbecoming to take the Eucharist *after* other food. To understand here, as Hofmann does, not the whole *meal*, but merely the *celebration of the Lord's Supper*, which was conjoined with it, is not in keeping with the phrase *δεῖπνον*, the precise scope of which is determined by the *meal so originally instituted* (John xiii. 2) to which it points.

Ver. 21. Προλαμβάνει] *takes beforehand* his own meal (as contrasted with κυριακ. δεῖπν., comp. Chrysostom : τὸ γὰρ κυριακὸν ἰδιωτικὸν ποιοῦσιν). Instead of waiting (ver. 33) till a general distribution be made and others thus obtain a share (comp. Xen. *Mem.* iii. 14. 1), and till by this means the meal assume the form of a κυριακὸν δεῖπνον, he seizes at once for himself alone upon the portion which he brought with him, and holds therewith his own private meal in place of the Lord's Supper. The expression is not "in the highest degree surprising," as Rückert calls it; but it is very *descriptive* of the existing state of matters. Grotius (comp. de Wette) is wrong in supposing that the *rich* ate first, and left *what remained* for the poorer members. This runs counter to the ἕκαστος, which must mean *every one* who brought anything with him. Of course, when the rich acted in the way here described, the poor also had to eat whatever they might have brought with them by themselves; and if they had nothing, then this abuse of the Lord's Supper sent them empty away, hungry and put to shame (vv. 22, 33). — ἐν τῷ φαγεῖν] not *ad manducandum* (Vulg.), but *in the eating, at the holding of the meal*. — πεινᾷ] because, that is to say, he had nothing, or but little, to bring with him, so that he remained unsatisfied, receiving nothing from the stores of the wealthier members. — μεθύει] *is drunken*, not giving the exact opposite of πεινᾷ, but making the picture all the fuller and more vivid, because πεινᾷ and μεθύει lead the reader in both cases to imagine for himself the other extreme corresponding to the one specified. We must not weaken the natural *force* of μεθ., as Grotius does, to "plus satis bibit." See on John ii. 20. Paul paints the scene in *strong* colours; but who would be warranted in saying that the reality fell at all short of the description?

Ver. 22. In a lively succession of questions the apostle shows how unsuitable and unworthy this procedure of theirs was. — μὴ γὰρ οἰκίας κ.τ.λ.] γὰρ has *inferential* force; see on Matt. xxvii. 23; John ix. 30; Acts xix. 35; and Winer, p. 416 [E. T. 559]; Kühner, *ad Xen. Mem.* i. 3. 10: *you surely are not without houses?* The sense of *astonishment* (Hartung, *Partikell.* I. p. 478) is conveyed by the question, not by the γὰρ. — ἡ τῆς ἐκκλησίας . . . ἔχοντας] a second counter question, which divides itself into two parts: ¹ *or*, again, is it the case with you that you are persons whose business it is (1) generally to *despise the church of God* (which you show by your not counting

¹ The underlying dilemmatic conclusion is: Persons who act as you do have *either* no houses, etc., *or* they despise the church

of God, etc.; you have houses, therefore you despise, etc.

its members worthy to eat and drink on a common footing with you), and (2) *to cause the poor to be put to shame?* The latter could not but feel themselves slighted, if they were not thought worthy of having a share in what the wealthier had provided. The main emphasis in the first clause is upon τῆς ἐκκλ. τ. Θεοῦ (Θεοῦ, "*dignitas ecclesiae*," Bengel, comp. ver. 16); in the second, upon κατασχύνετε. — Respecting οὐκ ἔχειν, *not to have*, to be poor, see Wetstein on 2 Cor. viii. 13; comp. οἱ ἔχοντες, *divites*, in Ast, *ad Plat. Legg.* v. p. 172; Bornemann, *ad Anab.* vi. 6. 38. Here, however, we have μή with the participle and article, because the *class* is referred to (Baeumlein, *Partik.* p. 296). — τί ὑμῖν εἶπω κ.τ.λ.] *what* shall I say to you? Shall I give you *praise?* On *this* point I praise *not*. If we keep ver. 17 in view, to connect ἐν τούτῳ with ἐπαινῶ gives a more suitable emphasis for the words than to link them with the preceding clause (Lachmann, Hofmann, with various codices and versions). On *other* points he *has* already praised them, ver. 2. The apostle's *deliberative* and *ceremonious* mode of expressing himself, and the result that he arrives at, could not but make the readers themselves feel how much they deserved the reverse of praise in this matter.

Ver. 23. Ground of the ἐν τούτῳ οὐκ ἐπαινῶ. *For I, for my part, have received the following instructions from Christ touching the institution of the Lord's Supper,¹ which I also delivered to you.* How should it be possible then that your disorder should meet with praise, so far as I am concerned, at variance as it is with the knowledge of the matter obtained by me from Christ and communicated to you? — ἀπὸ τοῦ Κυρίου] Had Paul written παρὰ τ. κ., this would have denoted that he had received the instructions *directly* from Christ (Gal. i. 12; 1 Thess. ii. 13, iv. 1; 2 Tim. iii. 14; Acts x. 22; John vi. 45, viii. 40, x. 18); ἀπὸ τ. κ., on the other hand, means *forth from* the Lord, *from the Lord's side as the source*, so that the preposition taken by itself leaves the question open whether the relation referred to be an *indirect* (so generally, including Gal. iii. 2; Col. iii. 24) or a *direct* one (as in Col. i. 7; 1 John i. 5; 3 John 7). And Hofmann does not go further than this indefinite relation, holding the only idea expressed here to be that of *origin* from the Lord; comp. also his *Schriftbew.* II. 2, p. 211. But seeing that, if what Paul had in view had been an *immediate* reception, it would have been natural for him, and of some importance for his argument, to express this distinctly by using παρὰ, while yet in point of fact he uses only ἀπό, we are warranted in assuming that he means a reception, which issued indeed from Christ as originator, but reached him only *mediately* through another channel. (v¹) This applies against Calovius, Bengel, Flatt, and others, including Heydenreich, Olshausen, de Wette (assuming a *confirmation* by special revelation of what he had learned from report), Osiander, who all find here a *direct* communication from Christ. The argument of Schulz and de Wette, however, against this latter view, on the ground of the word παρέλαβ. being in itself inappropriate, will not hold, especially when we view it as correlative to παρέδωκα; comp. xv. 3.

¹ Not merely regarding its *design* and *requirements* (Weiss, *bibl. Theol.* p. 353 f.); for

the special account of the institution itself, which follows, goes beyond that.

The question now remains : Does Paul, in asserting that his account of the institution *proceeded* from the Lord, mean to say simply that he received what follows by a *tradition* descending from Christ,¹ or by a *revelation* issuing from Christ? The latter alternative, which Rückert also adopts (*Abendm.* p. 194 f.), is not to be rejected on the ground of the following narrative being something with which all were familiar. For it is quite possible that it was wholly unknown to the apostle at the time of his conversion ; and even apart from that, it was so important for his apostolic vocation that he should have a sure and accurate knowledge of these facts, and to receive it by way of special revelation was so completely in harmony with Paul's peculiar position as an apostle, since he had not personally been a witness of the first Lord's Supper, that there is nothing to forbid our assuming that he received his account of the institution of this ordinance, like his gospel generally, in the way of authentic revelation from Christ. As to the *form* of mediate communication through which Christ had caused these facts to reach Paul, not appearing to him for this purpose Himself, we must leave that point undecided, since very various kinds of *media* for divine revelations are possible and are historically attested. It may have been by an utterance of the Spirit, by an angel appearing to him, by seeing and hearing in an ecstatic state. Only the contents of the revelation—from its essential connection with the *gospel*, and, in fact, with its fundamental doctrine of the work of reconciliation—exclude, according to Gal. i. 1, 12, 15, the possibility of human intervention as regards the apostle in the matter ; so that we should not be justified in supposing that the revelation reached him through some *man* (such as Ananias) commissioned to convey it to him by the Lord. As to the view that we have here a mere *tradition*, on the other hand, recounted by Paul as originating with Christ, the apostle himself decides against it both by his use of the singular (comp. xv. 3), and also by the significant prominence given to the *ἐγώ*, whereby he puts forward with the whole strength of conscious apostolic authority the communication made *to himself*, *to him personally*, by the Lord, over-against the abuse, contrasting with it, of the Holy Supper among the Corinthians. Had he meant simply to say : “I know it through a tradition proceeding from Christ,” then his *ἐγώ* would have been on the same level with every other, and the emphatic prominence which he gives to the *ἐγώ*, as well as the sing. *παρέλαβον*, would be quite unsuitable, because without any specific historical basis ; he would in that case have written : *παρελάβομεν γὰρ ἀπὸ τοῦ Κυρίου*. We have certainly therefore in this passage not merely the oldest account of the Lord's Supper, but even “an authentic explanation given by the risen Christ regarding His sacrament” (Olshausen) ; not one directly from His lips indeed, but conveyed through some medium of revelation, the precise form of which it is impossible for us now to determine, whereby we have a guarantee for the *essential contents* of the narrative independently of the Gospels, although not necessarily an absolute ultimate authority establishing the *literal form of the words of institution* (even in

¹ So Neander and Keim in the *Jahrb. für Deutsch. Theol.* 1859, p. 69.

opposition to Matthew and Mark), since a revelation of the history, nature, and meaning of the institution might be given even without any verbal communication of the words spoken in connection with it. — ὁ καὶ παρέδ.] *which I* (not only received, but) *also delivered to you*. Conversely in xv. 3. Instances of παραλαβ. and παραδοῖναι, in the sense of *discere* and *tradere*, may be seen in Kypke. — ὅτι] *that*, as in xv. 3, not *for*, as Luther and Hofmann render it. The latter translation would leave untold *what* Paul had received and delivered, in spite of the importance of the matter in question ; and it derives no support from the repetition of the subject, ὁ Κύριος, since that, with the addition of the sacred name Ἰησοῦς, gives a *solemn emphasis* to the statement. It is the full *doctrine* of the Lord's Supper, which they owe to him, that he is now setting before his readers. — ἐν τῇ νυκτὶ ἣ παρεδίδοτο (*imperfectum adumbrativum*, see Kühner, II. p. 73): *in the night in which His betrayal was going on* (hence not the aorist). It is a deeply solemn and arresting thought contrasted with the frivolity displayed among the Corinthians at the Agapae. The preposition is not repeated before the relative. Comp. Xen. *Anab.* v. 7. 17, *Mem.* ii. 1. 32, with Kühner thereon ; Plato, *Phaed.* p. 76 D, with Heindorf and Stallbaum *in loc.* — ἄρτον] *bread* (a cake of bread), which lay on the table.

REMARK.—The agreement which prevails between Paul's account of the Supper and that of Luke, is not to be explained by a dependence of Paul upon Luke (Grotius, comp. also Beza), but conversely. See on Luke xxii. 20, Remark.

Ver. 24. Τοῦτό μου ἐστὶ τὸ σῶμα] *This is my body* (the *body* of me). The emphasis lies not on the enclitic μου, but on τὸ σῶμα. See, further, on Matt. xxvi. 26, and Keim (in the *Jahrb. für Deutsch. Theol.* 1859, p. 73), as against Ströbel (in Rudelbach's *Zeitschr.* 1854, pp. 598, 602 ff.), who would have τοῦτο not to refer to the broken bread at all, but to point forward to what is to be designated by the predicate. This τοῦτο can mean nothing else whatever but : *this broken bread here*, which again *necessitates* our taking ἐστὶ as the copula of the *symbolic* “being.”—Otherwise the identity of the subject and predicate here expressed would be, alike for the speaker and the hearers, an impossible conception ; the body of the Lord was still alive, and His death, which answered to the breaking of the bread, was yet in the future. When we come, therefore, to define ἐστὶ more precisely in connection with that *first* celebration of the Supper, it is to be taken as “being” in the sense of *proleptic* symbolism ; and thereby the very possibility of the Lutheran synecdoche (upon which even Mehring falls back, in the *Luther. Zeitschrift*, 1867, p. 82) is done away. — τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν] *κλῶμενον* is spurious. We must supply simply ὅν : *which is for your behoof*, namely, by *its being broken* (slain¹). Christ's body was not, indeed, literally *broken* (John xix.

¹ This more precise explanation of the absolute τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν, *sc.* ὅν, is to be drawn from the preceding ἐκλάσε; and hence the addition of κλῶμενον is very *correct* in point of interpretation. But the word was not

spoken by Jesus, only the *thought* was expressed in the *action* of breaking the bread. This *silent* language of lively depicting suits well with the deep emotion of the moment ; and there is no ground either for regarding

33), but in His *violent* death our Lord sees that accomplished in His body which He had just done with the bread. This is the point of what he beholds in the broken bread looked upon by Him with such direct creative vividness of regard ; but in truth the simple τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν is more in keeping with the deep emotion of the moment than any attempt to expound in a more detailed way the symbolism which both *presents* and *interprets itself* in the breaking of bread ; and Matthew and Mark have not even this “for you.” — τοῦτο ποιεῖτε] to wit, what I now do ; not merely the *breaking* of the bread joined with a thanksgiving prayer, but also—as the action itself became the silent commentary on this τοῦτο — the *distribution* and *eating* of the bread ; comp. ver. 26. — εἰς τ. ἐμ. ἀνάμν.] *in remembrance of me*, presupposes His *absence* in body for the future ; see on Luke xxii. 19. We may add that these words also do not occur in Matthew and Mark, whose simple τοῦτό ἐστι τ. σῶμά μου carries it with a presumption of its being the original, unexpanded by any later explanation or reflection. Generally speaking, a like preference must be accorded to the narratives of the Supper by Matthew and Mark (and between those two, again, to that of Mark) over those of Paul and Luke.

Ver. 25. Ὡσαύτ. κ. τ. ποτ.] *sc. ἔλαβε καὶ εὐχαριστήσας ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς* (this last is to be taken from ἔκλασε), vv. 23, 24. — τὸ ποτήρ.] the cup which stood before Him. It was the cup which closed the meal, although there is no ground to connect μετὰ τὸ δεῖπν. here with τὸ ποτήρ., as Pott does. — ἐστίν] in the position which it has here, is decisive against our connecting ἐν τῷ ἐμῷ αἵμ. with ἡ κ. διαθ., as most interpreters do (Erasmus, Beza, Calvin, and many others, including de Wette, Rodatz, Maier, Hofmann), although Luther (in the *gr. Bek.*) rightly rejects that connection. What Christ says is, that *the cup is the new covenant in virtue of His blood*, which, namely, is in the cup. For in the wine of the cup the Lord sees nothing else than His blood which was about to be shed. This vividly concrete, direct, but *symbolical* mode of view at that solemn moment stands out in the sharpest contrast with the strife of the churches on the subject (for the rest, see on Luke xxii. 19 f.). Christ's *blood* became, by its being poured forth, the ἱλαστήριον,¹ whereby the new covenant² was founded (Rom. iii. 24 f., v. 3), the covenant of grace, in which were established, on man's side, faith in Christ,—not, as in the old covenant, the fulfilling of the law,—and on God's side forgiveness by the

the reading which admits κλώμενον as *probable* on internal evidence (Kahn, *Dogmat.* I. p. 616), or for characterizing that which rejects it as “vaga et frigida” (Reiche, *Comm. crit.*) ; nor will it do to explain the omission of the word by John xix. 36 f. (Hofmann). As to Hofmann's making κλώμ. refer only to the violent *bending and wrenching*, as the term is used of men under torture (see Wetstein) and by physicians, the very fact that the bread was *broken* should have sufficed of itself to forbid the idea.

¹ The *atonement* through the death of Jesus is at any rate the necessary *premiss*

of even the symbolical interpretation of the Lord's Supper. With every attempt to explain away the *atoning* death, the Supper becomes utterly unintelligible. Comp. Ebrard, *Dogma vom Abendm.* II. p. 752 ff.

² The word *covenant* is unquestionably genuine, for it is common to all the narratives ; but the designation of the διαθήκη as *καινή* dates from Paul, being a later more precise definition of the phrase. *Καινῆς* in Matt. xxvi. 27 and Mark xiv. 24 is spurious. This applies also in opposition to Baur in the *theol. Jahrb.* 1857, p. 551.

way of grace, justification, sanctification, and bestowal of eternal Messianic salvation. Comp. 2 Cor. iii. 6. And the Lord looks upon the cup as this covenant, because He sees in the wine of the cup His covenant-sealing blood. The cup therefore, in this deeply vivid symbolism of view is to Him as that which *contains* the *covenant-blood* of the *covenant*. — τοῦτο ποιεῖτε] to be taken so as to harmonize with ver. 24. Hofmann is wrong in thinking that Paul lays such special emphasis on this statement of the purpose of the Supper, because it appeared incompatible with the Corinthian mode of observing it. The apostle has no intention whatever here of laying emphasis either on one thing or another; he wishes only to *report*, in their simple *objectivity*, the sacred words in which the original institution was couched. What he desires to lay stress upon as against the Corinthians, comes in afterwards in ver. 26 ff. — ὡς ὅτις ἂν πίν.] peculiar to this account of the ordinance: *as often as ever* (*quotiescunque*, see Kühner, II. p. 94; comp. Bengel) *ye drink it*; the context supplies τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον as the object of πίν., without its having to be represented by a pronoun (αὐτό). See Krüger, § 60. 7; Kühner, *ad Xen. Mem.* i. 3. 4. The will of Jesus, according to this, is that *every time*, when they drink the *concluding cup* at the meal of communion, they should, in remembrance of Him, do with it as has now been done. Hofmann would make the words mean: *as often as ye are together at a meal*. But how can that be conveyed by the simple πίνετε? And it was certainly not a *drinking meal*, but a regular δεῖπνον (ver. 25). — Note, further, as to the ἂν, that it is placed after ὡς ὅτις, “quia in hac voce maximum sententiae pondus positum est,” Kühner, *ad Xen. Mem.* i. 1. 16.

Ver. 26. Not still words of *Christ* (Ewald),¹ in citing which Paul glides involuntarily into the form into which they had by this time become moulded in the church; for against this view there is (1) the unsuitableness in itself of such a ὑστερον πρότερον in the expression (especially after ver. 23); (2) the fact of the words being linked to the preceding by γάρ, which is less in keeping with the tone and direct form of the words of institution, but, on the other hand, naturally marks the apostle himself again beginning to speak; and (3) the fact that Luke has nothing of a similar kind in his account of the Supper. The *common* view is the right one, that *Paul* proceeds here *in his own person*. But what he gives is neither a further reason assigned for οὐκ ἐπαινῶ in ver. 22 (so Hofmann, in connection with his incorrect interpretation of ὅτι in ver. 23), nor is it an experimental elucidation of the last words of ver. 25 (the *ordinary* view), for the contents of ver. 26 stand rather in the logical relation of *consequence* to the foregoing narrative of institution. No; γάρ is to be taken here (comp. on ver. 22) in its *inferential* sense, and made to refer to the whole preceding account of the origin of the Supper. We may paraphrase thus: *Such, then, being the facts of the original institution, it comes to pass that as often as ye, etc.* — τὸν ἄρτον τοῦτον] the bread prescribed according to this appointment of Christ; τὸ ποτήριον: the cup now spoken of, the *eucharistic cup*. — καταγγέλλετε] *ye pro-*

¹ In the *Constitt. ap.* too (viii. 12. 16) they are placed in Christ's mouth, but with the

change of τὸν θάνατον τὸν ἐμὸν καταγγέλλετε, ἄχρισ ἂν ἔλθῃ.

claim the Lord's death, *i.e.* ye declare solemnly in connection with this ordinance, that Christ has died for you. This *καταγγέλλειν* cannot without arbitrariness be taken as merely a declaring *by action* (so *commonly*) ; it can only be taken as actually *oral*.¹ How it took place, we do not know. The Peshito (the Vulgate has *annuntiabit*) rightly took *καταγγ.* as *indicative*,² which Grotius and others ought not to have changed into *annuntiare debetis* ; for the proclamation in question was an *essential* thing which *took place* at the Supper, and therefore an *admonition* to it would have been inappropriate. Even in the case of unworthy participation the *καταγγέλλειν* referred to was not omitted ; the admonition, therefore, could only have respect to the worthiness of the participation, with which that *καταγγέλλειν* was connected ; and, in point of fact, such an admonition follows accordingly in ver. 27 f. We must reject therefore the view commonly taken by other interpreters (and necessarily adopted by Ewald in accordance with his view of the verse as given above), namely, that *καταγγ.* is *imperative*. See, besides, Rodatz in Lücke and Wieseler's *Vierteljahrschr.* I. 3, p. 351. — ἄχρις οὗ ἔλθῃ] *until He shall have come* ; for the apostle was convinced that the Parousia was close at hand, and therefore future generations could not have been present to his mind in writing thus ; but to *apply* his words to them is historically necessary and right. — ἄχρις stands without ἂν (see instances in Lobeck, *ad Phryn.* p. 15 f.), because the arrival of the Parousia is conceived as absolutely certain, not as conditioned by any contingencies which might possibly delay it (Hermann, *part. ἂν*, p. 109 ff.). In Gal. iv. 19 also, Paul, in the earnestness of his love, conceives the result as equally certain (against Rückert's objection). *After the Parousia the Lord Himself* is again there. Theodoret : μετὰ γὰρ δὴ τὴν αὐτοῦ παρουσίαν οὐκέτι χρεία τῶν συμβόλων τοῦ σώματος, αὐτοῦ φαινομένου τοῦ σώματος· Διὰ τοῦτο εἶπεν· ἄχρις οὗ ἂν ἔλθῃ. To eat *with Him* will then be a new thing (Matt. xxvi. 29) ; but until then the proclamation here spoken of is not to be silenced. How that thought was fitted to keep constantly before their minds the solemn responsibility of an unworthy participation in the Supper (see ver. 27) ! In this way Paul links to the *καταγγέλλειν* of the communicants the fear and trembling of the *Maranatha*, xvi. 22.

Ver. 27. From that *καταγγέλλειν κ.τ.λ.* it *follows* how great is the sin of participating *unworthily*. This reference of the ὥστε is sufficiently pointed and appropriate not to require us to go back further (to all that has been

¹ *Καταγγέλλειν* is always an actual *proclamation*, never a mere *giving to be known* by deeds. Were the latter the meaning here, Paul would be using a *poetical* expression (something like ἀναγγέλλειν in Ps. xix. 1 f.), which would be not at all suitable in view of the context. I regret that Hofmann has been so hasty in censuring my assertion of the necessity of the above interpretation, as if it carried absurdity on the face of it. We do not know in what forms a *liturgical* element had already developed itself in connection with a rite which had now been ob-

served for some quarter of a century. And have not the eucharistic liturgies up to this day, even the oldest that we are acquainted with (in Daniel, *Codex liturg.*), as for instance the "Liturgia Jacobi," essential parts, which are a *καταγγέλλειν* of the Lord's death? Comp. too the explicit confession prescribed at the Jewish feast of the Passover, Ex. xii. 27, xiii. 8.

² So also Theophylact, Beza, Bengel, de Wette, Osiander, Kahnis, Neander, Maier, Rückert in his *Abendm.* p. 211, Hofmann.

said from ver. 20 onwards), as Rückert would have us do. — ἡ πίνη] ἡ does not stand for καί (Pott and older expositors) ;¹ but the meaning is : if a man partake of the one *or* the other unworthily, he is alike guilty ; *neither* in the case of the bread *nor* of the wine should there be an unworthy participation. We must remember that the two elements were not partaken of in immediate succession, but the bread during the meal and the wine after it, so that the case was quite a possible one that the bread might be partaken of in a worthy, and the cup in an unworthy frame of spirit, and *vice versâ*. Comp. also Hofmann. The guilt, however, of the one or the other unworthy participation was the *same*, and was alike *complete* ; hence ἡ is not repeated in the apodosis. Roman Catholics (see Estius and Cornelius à Lapide) find in this ἡ a support for their “*communio sub una*.” See Calovius in opposition to this. — τοῦ Κυρίου] as κυριακόν in ver. 20, x. 21. — ἀναξίως] *in an unworthy manner*, i.e. *in a way morally out of keeping with the nature* (x. 16) *and design of the ordinance* (ver. 24 f.). Paul does not define it more closely ; hence, and because an unworthy participation may, in the concrete, occur in many different ways, the widely differing definitions of interpreters,² which are, however, quite out of place here. For the apostle leaves it to his readers to *rank* for themselves *their* particular way of communicating *under* the general ἀναξίως, and not till ver. 29 does he himself characterize the special form of unworthy participation which prevailed among them by ὁ γὰρ ἐσθίων κ. πίνων. See on the verse. — ἐνοχος ἐσται κ.τ.λ.] ἐνοχος with the dative and genitive (see Matthiae, p. 850) expresses the *liability of guilt* (see Bleek on Heb. ii. 15) : *he shall be*—from the moment he does so—*under guilt to the body and blood of Christ*, i.e. *crimini et poenae corporis et sanguinis Christi violati obnoxius erit* (comp. Jas. ii. 10, and the

¹ To this mistake, too, is to be traced the reading καί (in A D, some min. vss. and Fathers), which Fritzsche, *ad Rom.* III. p. 191, and Rückert approve. It was suggested by ver. 26, and gained support from the καί which follows ; but is not necessary, for there is a change of conception.

² Theophylact, following Chrysostom, makes it ὡς περιωρῶντας τοὺς πένητας. Theodoret holds that Paul hits at those fond of power in Corinth, the incestuous person, and those who ate the things offered to idols, and generally all who receive the sacrament with bad conscience. Luther : “he is worthy who has *faith* in these words, ‘broken for you, etc.’” Grotius : “qui hoc actu curat quae sua sunt, non quae Domini.” Bengel : “qui se non probant.” Flatt : not with thankful remembrance of the death of Jesus, not with reverence towards Him, not with love towards others ; so also in substance Rückert in his Commentary, and—with more detail and to some extent differently—in his work on the Lord’s Supper, p. 234. Billroth : with offence to the brethren. Olshausen : what is primarily meant

is want of love, a disposition to judge others, but with the underlying idea that it is impenitence that makes an unworthy communicant. Kahnis : “unbelief, which does not acknowledge a higher intrinsic worth in the Lord’s Supper.” At all events, it is the lack of a constantly present, lively, and active faith in the atonement brought about by Christ’s death, which is the *source* of the various states of moral unworthiness in which men may partake of the Supper : as was the case also with the Corinthians when they degraded it into an ordinary meal for eating and drinking (and Hofmann goes no further in his explanation of the ἀναξίως). The more earnest and powerful this faith is, the less can *that* participation, by which we are conscious of coming into communion with the body and blood of the Lord, and thereby commemorating Him, take place in a way morally unworthy. Bengel is right indeed in saying : “Alia est indignitas *edentis*, alia *esus*” (comp. Rückert, *Abendm.* p. 253) ; but the latter in its different moral forms is the necessary consequence of the former.

classical *ἐνοχος νόμοις*, Plat. *Legg.* ix. p. 869 B E) ; inasmuch, namely, as the proclamation of the Lord's death at the participation in the bread and the cup presupposes a moral condition which must be in keeping with this most sacred act of commemoration ; and if the condition of the communicant be of an opposite kind, then the holy body and blood, into communion with which we enter through such participation, can only be abused and profaned. Comp. ver. 29, *μὴ διακρίνων κ.τ.λ.* The often repeated interpretation : "par facit, quasi Christum trucidaret" (Grotius, following Chrysostom and Theophylact), appears once more in Ewald ; but it neither corresponds sufficiently with the words themselves (for had Paul meant that, he would have said distinctly and suitably : *ἐνοχος ἔσται τοῦ θανάτου τοῦ Κυρ.*), nor with the parallel thought in ver. 29. This holds, too, against Ebrard's view (*Dogma v. Abendm.* I. p. 126) ; each man by his sins has a share in causing the death of Jesus ; if now he communicates unworthily, not only do his other sins remain unforgiven, but there is added this fresh guilt besides, of having part in nailing Christ to the cross (which, with every other sin, is forgiven to the man who communicates worthily). But that would be surely no *new* guilt, but the continuance of the *old* ; and in this sense Kahnis explains it, *Dogmat.* I. p. 620. But to bring out this meaning, the apostle, if he was not to leave his words open to misunderstanding (comp. John iii. 36, ix. 41), must have written not *ἐνοχ. ἔσται*, but *ἐνοχ. μένει* or *μενεῖ*. Olshausen again, with older expositors, thinks that our passage implies a powerful argument against all Zwinglian theories of a merely commemorative ordinance. This, however, is too hasty and uncertain an inference ; because the profanation of an acknowledged symbol, especially if it be one recognized in the religious consciousness of the church (suppose, *e.g.*, a crucifix), does injury to the object itself represented by the symbol. Hofmann is not justified in disputing this. Comp. Oecolampadius, Piscator, and Scultetus, who adduce, as an analogous case, an injury done to the king's seal or picture.¹ Rückert, on the other hand, is wrong in supposing that we have here a proof that the bread and wine are only *symbols*.² For, even granting that they are *really* the body and blood of Christ, there was ground enough for the apostle's warning in the fact that his readers seemed to be forgetting this relationship. Our conclusion therefore is, that *this passage in itself* proves neither the one theory nor the other, as even Hofmann now acknowledges, although he goes on to infer from ver. 29 that Christ's real body and blood are partaken of in the Sacrament. See, however, on ver. 29, and comp. on x. 15 f.

¹ Luther's objection to this in the *Grosse Bekenntniss* resolves itself, in truth, into mere hair-splitting. The argument of the old systematic divines again is : The object against which we sin must be present ; we sin against the body and blood of Christ ; therefore these must be present. This conclusion is incorrect, because the major premiss is so. The *presence* of the object "in quod delinquimus quodque indigne tractamus" (Quenstedt) is not *always* necessary,

and need not be a *real* presence. Thus a man sins against the *body* of Christ, even when he sins against the sacred symbol of that body, and against the *blood* of Christ, in like manner. Comp. also Neander.

² Otherwise in his treatise *vom Abendm.* p. 236, where, on the ground of x. 3 f., x. 16, he does not doubt that what is meant is a direct offence committed against the very things there present.

Ver. 28. Δέ] carrying onward : “ now, in order not to incur this guilt, let a man examine himself, etc. ;” let him search into his frame of mind and moral condition (τὴν διάνοιαν ἑαυτοῦ, Theodore of Mopsuestia) to see whether he will not partake unworthily ;¹ (w¹) comp. διακρίνειν, ver. 31. — καὶ οὕτως] *and so*, after he has examined himself, *and in that case*. See on Rom. xi. 26. Every reader, not addicted to hairsplitting, would understand here of course that this did not apply to a case in which the result of the self-examination was to make the man feel himself unworthy. There was no need, therefore, for Flatt and Rückert (following Lightfoot, Semler, Schulz) to take δοκιμάζ. as meaning to *make qualified*, which it never does, not even in Gal. vi. 4 ; 2 Cor. xiii. 5 ; 1 Thess. ii. 4. — ἄνθρωπος] as iv. 1.

Ver. 29. Since ἀναξίως is spurious (see the critical remarks), ὁ ἐσθίων κ. πίνων might be understood absolutely : *the eater and drinker*, who turns the Supper, as was actually done at Corinth, vv. 22, 34, into a banquet and carousal. This was the view I held myself formerly, taking μὴ διακρίνων in the sense : *because* he does not, etc., as in Rom. iv. 19. But after ver. 28, whose ἐσθίειν κ. πίνειν finds expression here again, it is simpler and most in accordance with the text to render : *He who eats and drinks* (the bread and the cup), *eats and drinks a judgment to himself, if he does not, etc.*,” so that in this way μὴ διακρίνων κ.τ.λ. conditions the predicate, and is not a modal definition of the subject. The apostle might have written simply κρῖμα γὰρ ἑαυτῷ ἐσθίει κ. πίνει, μὴ διακρ. τ. σ. ; but the circumstantial description of the subject of the sentence for the second time by ὁ γὰρ ἐσθίων κ. πίνων carries a certain solemnity with it, making one feel the risk incurred by going on to eat and drink. — κρῖμα ἑαυτῷ κ.τ.λ.] a concrete expression (comp. 2 Cor. ii. 16) of the thought : *he draws down judicial sentence upon himself by his eating and drinking*. The power to effect this turns on the ἐνοχος ἔσται κ.τ.λ., ver. 27 ; and therefore nothing is decided here against the symbolical interpretation of the words of institution. That the κρῖμα is a *penal* one, is implied in the context (Rom. ii. 2, iii. 8, xiii. 2 ; Gal. v. 10). The *absence of the article*, again, denotes not eternal condemnation, but *penal judgment in general* without any limiting definition. From vv. 30 and 31 we see that Paul was thinking, in the first place, of *temporal judgments* as the penalty of unworthy communicating, and that such judgments appeared to him as chastisements employed by God to avert from the offender eternal condemnation. With respect to the dativus *incommodi* ἑαυτῷ, comp. Rom. xiii. 2. — μὴ διακρίνων τὸ σῶμα] *if he does not form a judgment upon* (so διακρ., Vulgate, Chrysostom, Theophylact, Bengel, de Wette, Weiss) *the body, i.e. the body κατ’ ἐξοχήν*, the sacred body, into communion with which he enters by partaking of the Supper, and respecting which, therefore, he ought to form a judgment of the most careful kind, such as may bring him into full and deep consciousness of its sacredness and saving significance (on διακρ., comp. xiv. 29 ; Matt. xvi. 3). Comp. Chrysostom : μὴ ἐξετάζων, μὴ ἐννοῶν, ὥς χρὴ, τὸ μέγεθος τῶν προκειμένων, μὴ λογιζόμενος τὸν ὄγκον τῆς δωρεᾶς. *Usually*

¹ Confession is an institution of the church, meant to aid in carrying out this rule of the apostle’s, in which the absolution gives

assurance that one does not eat and drink unworthily.

(so too Ewald, Kahnis, Hofmann) commentators have taken διακρ. in the sense of to *distinguish* (iv. 7), and have rendered accordingly : *if he* (or, following the reading which puts ἀναξίως after πίνων : *because he*) *does not distinguish the body of Christ from common food.*¹ Hofmann, again, seeing that we have not τοῦ Κυρίου along with τὸ σῶμα holds it more correct to render : *if he does not distinguish the body, which he who eats this bread partakes of, from the mere bread itself.* Both these ways of explaining the word, which come in substance to the same thing, proceed upon the supposition *either* that the body of Christ is that with which we enter into fellowship by partaking of the symbol (which is the true view), *or* that it is partaken of “in, with, and under” the bread (Lutheran doctrine), *or* by means of the transubstantiation of the bread (Roman Catholic doctrine). But in ver. 31, where διεκρίνομεν is taken up again from our passage, the word means to *judge*, not to *distinguish*, and we must therefore keep to that meaning² here also. — It was needless to add καὶ τὸ αἷμα to τὸ σῶμα, because the σῶμα is regarded as that which had suffered *death* by the shedding of its *blood* ; comp. ver. 26, also x. 17. The *twofoldness* of the elements has its rational significance only in the equal symbolism of the two ; apart from that symbolism, reference to it would be inappropriate, since, objectively, they cannot be separated.

Ver. 30. Proof of that κρίμα ἐαυτῷ . . . πίνει from the present experience of the Corinthians themselves. — Paul knew that there were at this time many cases of *sickness*, and not a few of *death* (κοιμῶνται), among them ; and he saw in this a divine chastisement for their unworthy use of the Lord's Supper. The explanation which refers this to *moral weakness and deadness* (Valckenaer, Morus, Krause, Eichhorn) is not to be rejected (as by Rückert) on the ground that this moral sickness and deadness must have been represented as the *cause* of the unworthy participation (for, from the Pauline standpoint, they might quite as well be regarded as its *consequence*, see Rom. i. 24 ff.). But it is to be set aside, because such a sense must have been suggested by the *context*, whereas there is not the remotest hint of it, either by itself or in connection with the physical interpretation (Olshausen). — κοιμῶνται] *dormiunt*, i.e. are *dead*. Comp., regarding this euphemistic allusion, what is said on xv. 18. Elsewhere in the N. T. we find the *perfect* or *aorist*. But comp. Lachmann's reading in 1 Thess. iv. 13. — It is impossible to establish a definite distinction of idea between ἀσθενεῖς and ἄρρωστοι. Grotius and Bengel hold the latter to mean more than the former ; Wetstein and Tittmann again (*Synon.* p. 76) differ from them in this. Both words denote want of strength from sickness.

Vv. 31, 32. *If, on the other hand, we judged ourselves* (submitted our own condition to moral criticism ; parallel to δοκιμάζειν ἐαυτόν, ver. 28), *then should we not receive any judgment* (judgment of condemnation, ver. 29) ; *but when*

¹ So Luther's gloss : who handles and deals with Christ's body as if he cared no more for it than for common food.

² Which stands in significant correspondence with κρίμα (comp. too, the oxymoron

in ver. 31) : a *judgment* . . . if he does not *form a judgment*. Hence there is the less warrant in the text for the meaning “*distinguish*.”

we do receive a judgment (in point of fact, by temporal sufferings), *we are chastened* (punished in a disciplinary way) *by the Lord* (by God), *in order that we may not be condemned* (namely, at the last judgment) *with the world* (along with the anti-Christian part of mankind. Note the oxymoron : *διεκρ. κριν. κατακριθ.*, answering significantly to the mutual relation of *κρίμα* and *διακρίνων* in ver. 29. In both passages we have the same sort of pointed alliteration, corresponding to their internal connection (which is plainly enough marked by the *διὰ τοῦτο*, ver. 30, and *δέ*, ver. 31, although Hofmann denies it). — As to the divine *chastisement*, which lies within the sphere of the divine redemptive agency (Heb. xii. 6 ; Tit. ii. 12 ; also 1 Tim. i. 20 ; 2 Tim. ii. 25), comp. J. Müller, *v. d. Sünde*, I. p. 339 f., ed. 5. — The use of the *first person* gives to the sentence the gentler form of a general statement, not referring merely to the state of things at Corinth, but of universal application.

Ver. 33. Conclusion from this proposition, general in its tenor, for the conduct of the readers at the love-feast, when they came together to keep it (*εἰς τὸ φαγεῖν*, not belonging to *ἀλλ. ἐνδέχ.*). — *ἀδελφοί μου*] “*perterrefactos rursum hac blanda compellatione solatur*,” Grotius. — *ἀλλήλ. ἐκδέχεσθε*] *wait for one another* (“*invicem exspectate*,” Vulg.), xvi. 11, so that no one *ἰδιον δεῖπνον προλαμβάνει*. This *closing* admonition corresponds to the censure, with which the section *began* in ver. 21, and there is therefore no need for departing from this rendering, which is adopted by Luther, Erasmus, and the majority of commentators. Theophylact : *δεικνύων, ὅτι κοινά εἰσι τὰ ἐκεῖσε εἰσφερόμενα, καὶ δεῖ ἀναμένειν τὴν κοινὴν συνέλευσιν*. Others translate : *Receive ye one another*, namely, *convivio*, as a contrast to despising the other guests, and keeping them from sharing in what you yourselves have to give. So Pott, Rückert, Olshausen, Ewald, Hofmann, following Mosheim, Michaelis, Morus, Schulz, Rosenmüller. But in the N. T. *ἐκδέχεσθαι* (xvi. 11) means always *exspectare* (comp. Soph. *Phil.* 123 ; Polyb. xx. 4. 5, iii. 45. 6 ; Apollod. i. 9. 27 ; also in Plutarch, *al.*), although in classical writers, as well as in the LXX. and Apocrypha, the meaning *excipere* is far more frequent. The latter sense Paul would have expressed by the simple *δέχεσθαι*, or by *προσλαμβάνεσθαι* (Rom. xiv. 1).

Ver. 34. To satisfy hunger, is a thing to be done at home. The Agapae should not be used as meals for such material purposes ; they have a higher significance. Comp. ver. 22. Others take it : “*If any one has such keen hunger that he cannot wait for the distribution, let him rather take a previous meal at home*” (Billroth ; comp. Erasmus, *Paraph.*). But how much of this is arbitrarily imported into the text ! — *τὰ δὲ λοιπά*] What has not yet been regulated in this section, vv. 17-34. The reference is to matters connected with the love-feasts ; not indeed of a doctrinal kind, but, as the word *διατάσσεσθαι* is enough of itself to show, pertaining to outward order and arrangements, vii. 17, ix. 14, xvi. 1 ; Gal. iii. 19 ; Tit. i. 5. A passage taken advantage of by Roman Catholics in support of their doctrine of *tradition*. And, no doubt, it does serve to establish in general the possibility of the existence of apostolic traditions ; but in each particular case in which such traditions are asserted, the burden of bringing forward the proof lies

always upon those who make the assertion, and it can never be produced. — *ὡς ἂν*] *whensoever* I shall have come ; in the temporal sense = *simulatque*. See on Phil. ii. 23, and Hartung, II. p. 289.

NOTES BY AMERICAN EDITOR.

(Q¹) “ *The woman is the glory of the man.*” Ver. 7.

The sense may be further expanded thus : The woman is in a certain respect subordinate to the man. She is not designed to reflect the glory of God as a ruler, but that of her husband as head of the household. She receives and reveals what there is of majesty in him. She always assumes his station ; becomes a queen if he is a king, and manifests to others the wealth and honour which may belong to her husband. Thus understood, the passage is no derogation to the sex, but rather a precise statement in accordance not only with Scripture, but with the results of all human experience ; and its position, united with the other teachings of this pericope, is a sure guarantee for woman's dignity, happiness, and honour.

(R¹) *Mosaic account of the creation.* Vv. 8, 9.

It is customary to speak of the Old Testament as mythical and fabulous, or at least allegorical. But the Apostle refers to the Mosaic narrative of man's creation as being literal fact. How then can any one who believes in the inspiration of the Apostles deny the divine authority of the Pentateuch, or confine that authority only to its doctrinal and preceptive statements ?

(S¹) *The teaching of nature.* Vv. 14, 15.

Some explain the Apostle's question as referring to the original course of nature. It has made a visible distinction between the sexes by covering the woman's head with more abundant hair. This teaches that the God of nature designs the sexes to be distinguished in the most conspicuous portion of the body. Short hair belongs to a man, long hair to a woman ; and it is unnatural and disgraceful for either sex in this respect to assume the appearance of the other. Others suppose that the word refers to the instinctive feelings which arise from nature's laws, and which are largely determined by education and habit. In this sense an Eastern woman feels impelled, whenever surprised by strangers, to cover her face. This to her is an instinctive impulse, yet it would not be so in a European or American woman. But Paul, writing to women of his own age and training, was sure of an affirmative response. F. W. Robertson well says : “ Fanaticism defies nature. Christianity refines it and respects it. Christianity does not destroy our natural instincts, but gives them a higher and nobler direction.”

(T¹) “ *We have no such custom.*” Ver. 16.

What is this custom ? Most of the recent critics (Stanley, Kling, Beet, Canon Evans, etc.) agree with Meyer in referring it to the contentiousness just mentioned. But besides the fact that “ if any one be contentious ” is not a custom, there is force in Alford's statement : “ Surely it would be very unlikely that,

after so long a treatment of a particular subject, the Apostle should wind up all by merely censuring a fault common to their behavior on this and on all the other matters in dispute. Such a rendering seems to me almost to stultify the conclusion. But for the weighty names on the other side it would seem hardly to admit of a question, that the custom here disavowed was the practice of women praying uncovered. He cuts off all further disputation on the matter by appealing to universal Christian usage."—Argument is useless with the contentious; they must be silenced by authority. It must be a very clear case of conscientious duty which will justify a man in departing from the established usages of the church.

(v¹) *The use of dissensions.* Ver. 19.

It is a great consolation, Hodge says, to know that dissensions, whether in church or state, are not fortuitous, but are ordered by the providence of God, and are designed as storms for the purpose of purification. Certain it is that the prevalence of heresies has been the occasion of bringing out more fully and plainly the faith of the church from the Apostle's age to our own.

(v¹) "*I received from the Lord.*" Ver. 23.

Meyer's reasoning supposes an unusual refinement in Paul's use of the Greek prepositions, and, besides, the ἀπό may have been chosen to avoid the triple repetition of παρά. The form of the revelation cannot be determined, but that it was directly from the Lord seems certain, and this fact is no small testimony to the importance of the ordinance, thus specifically made known to the Apostle.

(w¹) *The worthy communicant.* Ver. 28.

No better or briefer statement of what is required on this point can be found than is given in the answer of the Heidelberg Catechism to the question (81), Who ought to come to the table of the Lord? "Those who are grieved with themselves on account of their sins, and yet trust that the same are taken away from them, and their remaining weakness is covered by the suffering and death of Christ, and who also earnestly desire more and more to strengthen their faith and better their life."

CHAPTER XII.

Ver. 2. *ὅτι ὅτε*] approved by Griesb., adopted also by Lachm. (who brackets *ὅτε*, however), Scholz, Rück. Tisch. with A B C D E L *Σ*, min. and several vss. and Fathers. The *ὅτι* alone (Elz. with F G min. Syr. Erp. Clar. Germ. Oec. Ambrosiast.), and the weakly attested *ὅτε* alone (which Billroth and Ewald prefer), are two different attempts to help out the construction, whose difficulty leads Reiche again to defend the *Recepta*. — Ver. 3. Instead of the *Recepta* 'Ιησοῦν and Κύριον 'Ιησοῦν, which Reiche upholds, read 'Ιησοῦς and Κύριος 'Ιησοῦς, with Lachm. Rück. and Tisch., following A B C *Σ*, min. and several vss. and Fathers. The accusatives are the work of copyists altering the *oratio directa*, which struck them as unusual. — Ver. 9. In place of the second *αὐτῷ*, A B, min. Vulg. Clar. Germ. and Latin Fathers read *ἐνί*. So, rightly, Lachm. Rück. Tisch.; *αὐτῷ* has crept in after the preceding. — After *σώματος* in ver. 12, Elz. has *τοῦ ἐνός*, against greatly preponderating testimony. A gloss. — Ver. 13. *εἰς ἐν πνεῦμα*] Many various readings; the best accredited is *ἐν πνεῦμα* (B C D* F G *Σ*, 17, 73, 80, with several vss. and Fathers). So Lachm. Rück. Tisch. Reiche. The insertion of the *εἰς* arose from comparing the clause with the first half of the verse. Then, according as the words were understood to refer to the Supper or not, arose the readings *πόμα* (with or without *εἰς*) instead of *πνεῦμα*, and *ἐφωτίσθημεν* (said of baptism, as the Greek Fathers were accustomed to use it) instead of *ἐποστ*. — Ver. 31. *κρείττονα*] A B C *Σ*, min. Syr. Aeth. Vulg. ms. Or. (twice) read *μείζονα*. So Lachm. Rück. Tisch. But while *κρείττονα* might easily appear a doubtful expression in itself, and even objectionable as implying the contrast of “worse,” *μείζονα*, on the other hand, was very naturally suggested by xiii. 13, xiv. 5.

CONTENTS.—*Concerning the Spirit's gifts.*¹ The fundamental characteristic of speaking in the Spirit is the confession of Jesus as the Lord (ver. 3); but the especial utterances of the Spirit, which are given to individu-

¹ Baur, in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1838, p. 646 f., holds that the abuse of the *glossolalia* in Corinth, which has certainly given occasion to this section of the Epistle, had arisen in the party-interest of the Petrine Christians in opposition to the Pauline. The former, he maintains, had brought the γλ. λαλ. to bear against the latter, denying to Paul the apostolic character and consequently the possession of the πνεῦμα ἅγιον. But there is no trace of this whatever in the apostle's treatment of the subject; for the word thrown out at vii. 40, in connection with a totally different occasion, has no bearing at all upon this question; and xiv. 6 and 18 take for granted that his readers admitted that Paul himself had the gift of the *glosso-*

lalia, and that in a high degree. Rübiger, too, agrees in substance with Baur, assuming, as he does, an opposition between the Pauline προφητεύοντες and the Petrine γλώσσαις λαλοῦντες. But there is not the slightest support in the text either, in general, for connecting the subject in hand with the state of parties at Corinth, or, in particular, for ascribing the *glossolalia* to any one special party (Dähne, *e.g.*, regards it as a piece of Alexandrian fanaticism among the *Christ-party*). Van Hengel's conjecture, also (*Gave d. talen*, p. 111 f.), that Apollos had brought the *glossolalia* to Corinth, where it had been abused and had degenerated, lacks all definite foundation.

als for the welfare of the community (vv. 7–10), differ one from another (vv. 4–6). The Giver of all gifts, however, is one and the same Spirit ; for Christians form an organic whole, like the limbs of one body, so that none of them ought either to judge himself in a depreciatory spirit (vv. 11–20), or to ignore the need and worth of those with fewer or lower gifts (vv. 21–30. Still there ought to be a striving after the more excellent charismata ; and Paul will show his readers the best kind and mode of thus striving (ver. 31). — The peculiar *difficulty* attaching to this whole section is very truly described by Chrysostom : τοῦτο ἅπαν τὸ χωρίον σφόδρα ἐστὶν ἀσαφές· τὴν δὲ ἀσάφειαν ἡ τῶν πραγμάτων ἄγνοιά τε καὶ ἑλλειψις ποιεῖ, τῶν τότε μὲν συμβαινόντων, νῦν δὲ οὐ γινομένων.

Ver. 1. Δέ] leads over from the matter previously discussed to another, in connection with which also abuses had crept into the church (see on xi. 18). We are warranted in assuming that the discussion of such a subject, so comprehensive and entering so much into details, was occasioned by questions put in the letter from Corinth (vii. 1, viii. 1). — τῶν πνευματικῶν] is to be taken (with Chrysostom, Luther, and most expositors) as *neuter*, stating the *theme* in a quite general way : *On the forms of action which proceed from the Holy Spirit and make manifest His agency in the life of the church.* The speaking with tongues is *specially* taken up only in chap. xiv., so that it is a mistake to regard πνευματ. as referring to this alone (Storr, Heydenreich, Billroth, Baur in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1838, p. 644, and Wieseler in the same, p. 711, also Ewald). The πνευματικά are in their nature the same as the χαρίσματα, ver. 4. Other interpreters make it *masculine* (Grotius, Hammond, Clericus, Locke, Semler, Morus, Rosenmüller, Stolz, Heydenreich, Ewald, Hofmann, also David Schulz, *d. Geistesgaben der ersten Christen*, p. 163 ; and Hilgenfeld, *die Glossolalie*, 1850, p. 16) : “ *concerning the inspired, whether genuine or not ;* Ewald renders : “ *concerning the men of the Spirit*” (speakers with tongues). But in xiv. 1 we have the theme recurring as τὰ πνευματικά. — οὐ θέλω ὑμ. ἄγνοεῖν] *I will not leave you in ignorance.* Comp. x. 1 ; 1 Thess. iv. 13. Theodore of Mopsuestia puts it aptly : θέλω ὑμᾶς καὶ τῶν πνευματικῶν χαρισμάτων εἰδέναι τὴν τάξιν, ὥστε βούλομαί τι καὶ περὶ τούτων εἰπεῖν.

Ver. 2. Reason (comp. on διό, ver. 3) why he wishes to instruct them concerning the πνευματικά. The pneumatic condition into which they had entered as Christians was, of course, an entirely new one to men who had been heathen, entirely without precedent or analogy in the experiences of their former sad estate,—all the more, therefore, requiring to be subjected to a trustworthy and correct judgment. — The construction, when we adopt the reading ὅτι, ὅτε, is simply this : the object-sentence begins indeed with ὅτι, but instead of ending with ἀπήγεσθε, or repeating ἦτε before ἀπαγόμε., runs off into the participle,—an anakoluthic use of the ὅτι not uncommon also in classic writers, after parenthetical clauses, even when but short, have intervened. See Krüger on *Thuc.* iv. 37 ; Stallbaum, *ad Plat. Apol.* 37 B ; Heind. *ad Plat. Gorg.* p. 481 D. Translate : *Ye know that, at the time when ye were heathen, ye were led away to the dumb idols, in whatever way people led you.* Buttmann (*neut. Gr.* p. 329 [E. T. 383]) holds that the sentence after

ὅτε ἔθνη ἦτε passes with ὡς into an indirect question. But ὡς ἂν ἡγεσθε, from its position between πρὸς τ. εἰδ. τ. ἄφ. and ἀπαγόμε., can only be a parenthetic clause. In that case, too, ἀπαγ. would be cumbrous and dragging at the end of the verse ; it must convey a weighty closing thought, to which ὡς ἂν ἡγεσθε serves as modal definition. Hofmann, although not reading ὅτι, ὅτε, but simply ὅτι with Elz. (which in fact does away of itself with all real difficulty), has twisted and obscured the whole passage in a very unhappy way.¹ — ὅτε ἔθνη ἦτε] A reminder to his readers of their sad ποτέ, to which Paul often turns back their eyes from their happy νῦν (Eph. ii. 2 f., 11, 13, v. 8 ; Col. i. 21, iii. 7 ; Rom. xi. 30). — πρὸς τὰ εἰδωλα] namely, in order to worship them, sacrifice to them, invoke them, inquire of them, and the like. — τὰ ἄφωνα] (Plat. *Pol.* I. p. 336 D, and often elsewhere ; Dem. 292. 6. 294. 19 ; 2 Macc. iii. 24) impresses on the readers that idols, which were themselves *dumb* (comp. Hab. ii. 18 ; 3 Macc. iv. 16), could produce no pneumatic speaking. Notice the emphatic repetition of the article. — ὡς ἂν ἡγεσθε] *as ye were at any time led*. Regarding this ἂν of repetition, see Fritzsche, *Conject.* I. p. 35 ; Buttmann, *neut. Gr.* p. 186 f. [E. T. 216] ; comp. on Acts ii. 45. — ἀπαγόμενοι] *becoming led away*. The force of the ἀπό is not that of removal from the normal condition of the natural knowledge of God (Rom. i. 19 ff.), an interpretation which would need to be suggested by the context ; but it serves *vividly to set forth the result*. The consequence of the ἄγεσθαι, namely, was the ἀπάγεσθαι, the being involuntarily drawn *away* from the surroundings in which they were actually placed to the temples, statues, altars, etc. of the idols. We may take it for certain, from Paul's views of heathenism (x. 20 ; Eph. ii. 2), that he thought of *Satan* as the *leading power*. Hilgenfeld aptly compares the passage in Athenagoras, *Legat. pro Christ.* p. 29, ed. Col. : οἱ μὲν περὶ τὰ εἰδωλα αὐτοὺς ἐλκοντες οἱ δαίμονες εἰσιν κ.τ.λ. The opposite is πνεύματι ἄγεσθαι, Rom. viii. 14 ; Gal. v. 18 ; Matt. iv. 1. Others make it : *a sacerdotibus* (Valckenaer, *al.*), and the like. — We may note further both that *homoioteleuta*, such as οἶδατε, ὅτι ὅτε . . . ἦτε, occur even in the best writers, showing that the resemblances of sound were not offensive to them (Lobeck, *ad Aj.* 61, *Paral.* p. 53 ff.), and also that the subject in hand is brought all the more vividly and impressively home by the *adnominatio*, ἡγεσθε, ἀπαγόμενοι (Bremi, *ad Lys.* I. *Exc.* vi. p. 209).

¹ Hofmann insists, namely (1st), on reading οἶδα τε instead of οἶδατε, and (2d) ὡς ἀνήγεσθε instead of ὡς ἂν ἡγεσθε and (3d) on taking ὅτι ἔθνη ἦτε as: *because ye were heathen*, and that as specifying the reason for what follows, in which, for the sake of emphasis, πρὸς . . . ἄφωνα is put before the ὡς. But how *involved* the whole general structure of the sentence becomes in that way ! How wholly *uncalled for*, nevertheless, and inappropriate would be the investing of the quite superfluous (quite superfluous, to wit, as specifying a reason) “ *because ye were heathen*,” with all the emphasis of being *put first* in a hyperbaton which is,

moreover, *doubled* ! And how *strange* the choice of the compound ἀνήγεσθε, since it does not (as Hofmann supposes) convey the notion of *whither* (which is expressed by πρὸς), but that of *upward*, as ἀνάγειν always means to lead *up* ! The τέ, too, after οἶδα, would not be suitable even in a *logical* point of view (see note on ver. 3). Laurent, in his *neut. Stud.* p. 132, agrees with Hofmann in so far that he also reads ὡς ἀνήγεσθε instead of ὡς ἂν ἡγεσθε. For the rest, he retains οἶδατε, and neither reads ὅτι nor ὅτι, ὅτε, but simply ὅτε, which is supported by very slender evidence.

Ver. 3. Διό] *therefore*, because the experiences of spiritually gifted men could not be known to you in your heathen state,¹ and you have consequently all the more need of sound instruction on the subject, *therefore I give you to know*: the fundamental characteristic of speaking by the Spirit is, *that Jesus is not execrated, but confessed as Lord*. Paul expresses this in the two parallel thoughts: that the former, the *execration*, comes from the lips of no inspired person; and that the latter, the *confession of the Lord*, can only be uttered by the power of the Holy Spirit. Both the *negative* and the *positive* marks are thereby given; and it is arbitrary to lay the whole stress, as Billroth and Rückert do, upon the second half, and to regard the first as almost superfluous and a mere foil to the second. Paul must, moreover, have had his own special *reasons* for placing such a *general guiding rule* at the head of his whole discussion in answer to the question, Who in general is to be held an inspired speaker? Among all the different forms and even perversions of the gift of speaking in the Spirit at Corinth, men may have been divided upon the question, *Who* was properly to be regarded as speaking by the Spirit, and who not? and against all arbitrary, envious, exclusive judgments on this point the apostle strikes all the more powerfully, the more he brings out here the *width* of the specific field of speaking in the Spirit, and the *more simply and definitely* he lays down at the same time its characteristics. To find any special reference here to the *speaking with tongues*—and in particular to go so far in that direction as to assume (Hofmann, comp. his *Schriftbew.* I. p. 309) that the first clause guards against

¹ Similarly de Wette; comp. Bengel, and, yet earlier, Luther's gloss. Osiander draws in a contrast between the one Lord of the Christians and the many *κυρίους* of heathenism. Moreover, widely differing statements as to the connection are to be found among interpreters. Chrysostom, Oecumenius, and Theophylact trace it back in a perfectly arbitrary way to the contrast between the unconscious mania of heathen inspiration and the conscious inspiration of Christians. Comp. Neander: "because it is now otherwise with you, and you have become free organs of the Holy Spirit." Kling (in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1838, p. 486) makes it: "that you may not suffer yourselves to be again carried away to blind worship of an unintelligible phenomenon" (?). Theodoret holds that what is referred to is the contrast between the *διαφωρία* of heathenism and the *συμφωνία* in Christianity. In like manner Rübiger: "because your heathen cultus did not rest upon a common Divine Spirit ruling in you all, I make it known to you that there is such a principle in Christianity in the *πνεῦμα Θεοῦ*." But in this way the essential point on which the question hinges is only gained by *abstraction* out of what Paul *actually* says, and that in the interest of the

assumption that he designs to secure for the *glossolalia* the respect due to it as against the opposition of the Pauline party. Paul is here making known to his readers the *criterion* of Christian inspiration as regards its confession, and that *for this reason* (διό), because they, as formerly serving dumb idols, had all the more *need* of this *γνωρίζειν*. The words before us yield no more than this. Ewald also imports too much into them: You will not surely wish back your former heathen days; . . . it is in the light of that old state of things that one first really comes rightly to understand and feel the value of Christianity, and so forth. Hofmann shapes the connection in accordance with his construction of the text in ver. 2: because Paul does not wish to leave his readers in the dark *περὶ τ. πνευματικῶν*; and because, on the other hand, he knows what their old life had been as respects divine service, *therefore* he gives them the following instructions. This is *logically incorrect*. For the second element in this case would not be one *brought forward in addition* to the first (τε), but one already *lying at the root* of it; and Paul must therefore have written, not *οἰδά τε* (as Hofmann reads), but *οἶδα γαρ*.

anxiety in presence of the *γλώσσαις λαλεῖν*, and the second against undervaluing the *προφητεύειν*—comes just to this, that Paul has expressed himself in a highly unintelligible way, and arbitrarily anticipates the elucidations in detail which follow. — *ἐν πνεύματι Θεοῦ*] so that the Holy Spirit is the element which pervades his inner life, and in which the *λαλεῖν* takes place. Comp. on Rom. viii. 15 ; Matt. xxii. 43. — *λαλῶν*] *uttering himself, speaking*; *λέγει*, on the other hand, has reference to the *object* of the utterance. Comp. on Rom. iii. 19 ; John viii. 43 ; Schulz, *Geistesgaben*, p. 94 ff. — *ἀνάθεμα Ἰησοῦς*] *sc. ἐστί, accursed* (see on Rom. ix. 3 ; Gal. i. 8), fallen into eternal perdition *is Jesus!* This is the anti-Christian (especially the Jewish) confession ; the Christian is : *Κύριος Ἰησοῦς, Jesus is Lord!* Comp. Phil. ii. 11. Why did Paul not say *Χριστός* ? Because, from its original appellative meaning, it would not have suited the first clause (*ἀνάθ.*) ; in the second, again, its appellative meaning is contained in *Κύριος* ; and in both it was essential to name the historical Person who was the Messiah of the Christians' faith as exalted to be the *σύνθρονος* of God. It is self-evident, we may add, that Paul regarded the *Κύριος Ἰησοῦς* as the *constant watchword* of the believing heart, and the *keynote* of inspired speech. (x¹) “*Paulus loquitur de confessione perseveranti et in tota doctrina,*” Melanchthon. — Regarding the confession itself, comp. 1 John iv. 1 f., where the proposition is of substantially the same import, only still more directly aimed against false teachers.

Ver. 4. Although the fundamental character of all inspired speaking is not in any case different : *there are, notwithstanding, distributions of grace-gifts* (“*divisiones gratiarum,*” Vulg.), *but it is the same Spirit* (from whom they proceed). Comp. Heb. ii. 4, and Lünemann upon that passage. *Χάρισμα*,¹ a specifically N. T. word, foreign to ordinary Greek, is used here in the narrower sense (for in the wider sense, every manifestation of divine grace—in particular, every part of the Christian possession of salvation, and every activity of the Christian life—is a *χάρισμα*). It means any extraordinary faculty, which operated for the furtherance of the welfare of the Christian community, and which was itself wrought by the grace of God, through the power of the Holy Spirit, in special individuals, in accordance, respectively, with the measure of their individual capacities, whether it were that the Spirit infused entirely new powers, or stimulated those already existing to higher power and activity, Rom. xii. 6 ff. Regarding *διαίρεσις*, *distribution*, comp. ver. 11 ; Xen. *Cyr.* iv. 5. 55 ; Plat. *Soph.* p. 267 D, *Phaedr.* p. 266 B, *Polit.* p. 275 E ; Polyb. ii. 43. 10 ; Ecclus. xiv. 15 ; Judith ix. 4. The charismatic endowment is not something undivided ; we do not find a unity and equality among the gifted, but there are *distributiones donorum* ; so that one has this peculiar *χάρισμα*, and the other that, dealt out to him as his own appointed share. If we take *διαίρεσις* to mean *differences* (Beza, and many others, including de Wette, Ewald), this is equally lawful so far as linguistic

¹ Comp. Krumm, *De notionib. psychol. Paulin.*, Gissae 1858, p. 35 ff. As regards the difference between the general Christian

χαρίσματα and the extraordinary, see *Constit. ap.* viii. 1. 1 ff.

usage goes (Plat. *Soph.* p. 267 B, *Prot.* p. 358 A), but does not correspond to the correlative purposely chosen by the apostle in ver. 11, *διαποῶν*.

Vv. 5, 6. Continuation of the representation of the difference and yet relative unity of the *χαρίσματα*, illustrated in two characteristic forms of their action, in so far, namely, as they present themselves practically as *διακονίαι* and as *ἐνεργήματα*. These are not merely different names for the charismata (as the Greek Fathers held), nor yet distinct species of them (Estius and others), but different forms of expression in which they show themselves and appear to the observer. — *And there are distributions of services, but it is the same Lord* (Christ as Lord of the church) who is served thereby. To make the *διακονίαι* refer to the specific offices in the church, ver. 28 (Beza, Grotius, Estius, Olshausen, and many others), is to narrow the meaning too much; for in accordance with the first sentence, and in accordance generally with the comprehensive scope of the whole three sentences, *all* charismata must be meant, in so far, namely, as *all, according to the relation of their exercise to Christ, manifest themselves as services rendered*. — “*And there are distributions of workings* (deeds of power), *but it is the same God who works them all* (*ἐνεργήματα*) *in all* (in all who are acting in the power of the Spirit).” *Ἐνεργ.* is as little to be taken in a *special* sense here as *διακ.* in the previous sentence; it is neither to be referred to the working of *miracles* alone (so most interpreters on the ground of ver. 10, where, however, it is joined with *δυνάμ.*), nor to the *healings of the sick* (so Olshausen, quite arbitrarily). No, *all* charismata may manifest their operation in *deeds* (comp. on *ἐνεργήματα*, Polyb. ii. 42. 7, iv. 8. 7; Diod. iv. 51), whether these be miraculous or not.

REMARK.—The Divine Trinity is here indicated in an ascending climax (comp. on Eph. iv. 6), in such a way that we pass from the *Spirit*, who bestows the gifts, to the *Lord*, who is served by means of them, and finally to *God*, who, as the absolute First Cause and Possessor of all Christian powers, works the entire sum of charismatic deeds in all thus endowed. This passage has always (from Chrysostom and Theodoret onwards) been rightly adduced in opposition to anti-Trinitarian error (comp. too Calovius against the Socinians); but it is to be observed also here, that with all the equality of nature and inseparable unity (2 Cor. xiii. 13) of the Three, still no dogmatic canon can do away with the relation of subordination which is also manifest. Comp. Gess, *v. d. Person Christi*, p. 158 f.; Kahnis, *Dogm.* III. p. 206 ff.

Ver. 7. Δέ] leading on to the like *destination* of all the gifts. The emphasis lies on *πρὸς τὸ συμφέρον*. This is the aim, which is the same in the case of every one who receives a gift. *To each one is the manifestation of the Spirit* (his making known the Holy Spirit to others by charismatic acts) *given with a view to benefit* (in order to be of use, see xiv. 12). The genitive is to be taken in this *objective* sense (with Billroth, Schulz, *Geistseg.* p. 164, and Hofmann), because there exists no reason here for departing from the similar meaning of *φανέρ. τῆς ἀληθ.* in 2 Cor. iv. 2; and we have no other instance of the use of the word except in the Fathers. Calvin, Rückert, de Wette, and most expositors understand it *subjectively*: *the self-revelation of*

the Spirit. Even on the first interpretation there is not too much concession to independent human activity (in opposition to de Wette), as is plain from the very idea of the *δίδοται*.

Ver. 8 ff. Now one man may receive one, and another another endowment from the same Spirit. The following nine charismata, enumerated in a preliminary way up to ver. 10 (besides which, others are afterwards mentioned, ver. 28), are divided into three classes, which cannot, however, correspond to the three *διαίρεσεις*, vv. 4–6, because there *each* sentence comprises *all* charismata. The *external* division is distinctly marked by Paul himself in this way, namely, that he notes the transition to a *new* category by *ἐτέρω*¹ (while for subdivision *within* the classes he uses *ἄλλω*), thus : (1) ver. 8, by *ὃ μὲν* ; (2) ver. 9, by *ἐτέρω δέ* ; (3) ver. 10, by *ἐτέρω δέ*. The *logical* division again, although not rigidly carried out, presents itself without constraint as follows :

I. Charismata which have reference to *intellectual* power :

1. *λόγος σοφίας*.
2. *λόγος γνώσεως*.

II. Charismata which depend upon special *energy of faith* :

1. The *πίστις* itself.
2. Its agency in *deeds*, namely,
 - a. *ἰάματα*.
 - b. *δυνάμεις*.
3. Its agency in *words*, namely, the *προφητεία*.
4. Its *critical* agency, the *διάκρισις πνευμ.*

III. Charismata which have reference to the *γλῶσσαι* :

1. Speaking with tongues.
2. Interpretation of tongues.²

Ver. 8. *Ὡ μὲν*] This is followed by *ἄλλω δέ* instead of *ὃ δέ*. An unexact expression, as in ver. 28. Comp. Xen. *Anab.* iii. I. 35 ; Hermes in Stob. *Ecl. phys.* 52, p. 1082. — *λόγος σοφίας*] Discourse of wisdom, discourse the contents of which are *σοφία*. The distinction drawn by *many* (including Schulz, Neander, Billroth, Olshausen, comp. also Froschammer, *von d. Cha-*

¹ Whether after *ἐτέρω*, vv. 9 and 10, we read *δέ* or not (which Lachmann brackets in ver. 9 and deletes in ver. 10) makes no difference at all as regards the marking of the divisions (in opposition to Hofmann); the divisions mark themselves by the way in which the *ἐτέρω* stands out from the many repetitions of *ἄλλω*. In several cases the *δέ* too, after *ἄλλω*, is wanting in important witnesses.

² Other modes of division may be seen in Kling, *Stud. u. Krit.* 1839, p. 477 ff. ; Englmann, *von d. Charismen*, 1858, who, however, divides them into *official* and *non-official*, which does not correspond with the conception and nature of the gifts ;

Krumm, *l.c.*, who bases his division on the categories *πνεῦμα, καρδία, νοῦς* ; de Wette renounces any arrangement ; Hofmann divides according to the categories of the *cognitive* faculty (*λόγ. σοφ.*, and *λόγ. γνώσεως*) of the *volitional* faculty (*πίστις, ἰάματα, δυνάμεις*), and of the *power of the Holy Spirit* (*προφητεία κ.τ.λ.*). Bengel puts it aptly : “ *ὃ· ἐτέρω· ἐτέρω : huius, alteri, alteri,—genera tria.* ”—The distinction between II. and III. arises from the fact that the *γλῶσσαι* were an entirely *peculiar χάρισμα*, in connection with which the agency of the *νοῦς* was absent. In ver. 28 also the *glossolalia* is ranked in a class by itself.

rismen, 1850, p. 28 ff.) between this and λόγος γνώσεως, according to which the former is a more *practical*, the latter a more *theoretical* method of teaching (Bengel, Storr, Rosenmüller, Flatt reverse it, comp. Cornelius à Lapide), is an unlikely one, seeing that the separation between theory and practice is not in keeping with the nature of inspired discourse. The more correct view is indicated by ii. 6 f. compared with xiii. 2 ; σοφία, namely, is the *higher Christian wisdom* (see on ii. 6, comp. Eph. i. 17) in and by itself, so that discourse, which enunciates its doctrines (mysteries), elucidates, applies them, etc., is λόγος σοφίας. This, however, does not yet imply the *deep and thorough knowledge* of these doctrines, the speculative insight into, and apprehension and elaboration of, their connection, of their grounds, of their deeper ideas, of their proofs, of their ends, etc., and a discourse which treats of *these matters* is λόγος γνώσεως.¹ Accordingly the σοφία cannot cease at the Parousia, but the γνῶσις ceases, xiii. 8, because it belongs to the category of imperfect temporal things. (γ¹) Others interpret otherwise. Chrysostom,² Theodoret, Oecumenius, Theophylact are wrong in holding that the possession or the want of the teaching faculty makes the difference between σοφία and γνῶσις. See, on the contrary, xiii. 8 ; 2 Cor. xi. 6. Baur makes γνῶσις refer to the unfolding of the deeper meaning of Scripture chiefly through allegorical exegesis, which is totally without proof. De Wette gives no explanation : Osiander explains as we do. Hofmann makes σοφία a property of the *subject* (see in opposition to this, ii. 6 : σοφίαν λαλοῦμεν), one, namely, which qualifies for right judgment in general ; γνῶσις, again, *a relation to an object*, namely, the thorough mastery of it in the particular instance in hand. But in that case the γνῶσις would only be the *application* of the σοφία *in concreto*, and Paul would thus not be adducing two χαρίσματα distinct in character from each other.—κατὰ τὸ αὐτὸ πνεῦμα] *according to the same Spirit*. Comp. ver. 11, and the classical κατὰ Θεόν, according to *divine destination* (Valckenaer, *ad Herod.* iii. 153). The prepositions διά, κατά, ἐν, are not equivalent in meaning (Rückert), but they so express the relation of the Spirit to the divine bestowal (δίδοται), according to the different aspects of His participation therein, as to show that He is *medians, normans, or continens*, with respect to the different gifts in question.

Ver. 9. Ἐτέρῳ] not ἄλλῳ again, because introducing another class which *differs* in kind from the preceding one. Comp. on Gal. i. 6 ; 2 Cor. xi. 4 ; Matt. xvi. 14. —πίστις] cannot be the *fides salvifica* in general, seeing that this is a possession common to all and required of *every* Christian, not a peculiar charisma of certain individuals. Hence it has been understood by most commentators, following the Fathers, (see in Suicer, *Thes.* II. p. 727),

¹ According to Ewald, λόγος σοφίας embraces more the intelligent explanation and establishment of recognized truths, with a view to profit in life ; λόγος γνώσεως, more the treatment of obscurer and more hidden portions of knowledge. But ii. 6 ff. shows that the latter also are included under the σοφία.

² Paul and John, he says, had the λόγος σοφίας ; the λόγος γνώσεως was possessed by οἱ πολλοὶ τῶν πιστῶν, γνῶσιν μὲν ἔχοντες, διδάσκειν δὲ οὕτως οὐ δυνάμενοι. In like manner now Krumm asserts, “ γνώσεως, proprietatem in *argumentis*, σοφίας, in *forma positam* esse.”

to refer to the *fides miraculosa*, Matt. xvii. 20. But this is clearly too narrow a meaning, since not only the *ιάματα* and *δυνάμεις* are ranked under this head, but also the *προφητεία* and the *διακρίσεις πνευμ.* What is intended, therefore, must be a *high degree of faith in Christ* produced by the Holy Spirit, a *heroism of faith*,¹ the effects of which manifested themselves in one in healings, in another in wonders, in a third in prophecy (Rom. xii. 6), in a fourth in discernment of spirits. — *ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ πν.] in the same Spirit*, so that, contained in this Spirit, the *χάρισμα* is given, and the Spirit thus includes in Himself the gift. — *χαρίσμ. ἰάμ.] gifts, through means of which healings are effected.* The instances in the Acts of the Apostles show that this does not mean natural skill, but cures wrought by spiritual power upon bodily maladies (miraculous cures). Comp. Mark xvi. 18 ; Acts iv. 30. It does not, however, exclude the application of natural means in connection with the power that wrought the cure (Mark vii. 33, viii. 23 ; John ix. 6, *al.*; Jas. v. 14). The *plural* *χαρίσματα* points to the different kinds of sickness, for the healing of which different gifts were needful.²

Ver. 10. *Ἐνεργήματα δυνάμ.] workings* (ver. 6) *which consist in acts of power.* It is a purely arbitrary assumption that by this is meant merely the “*potes- tas puniendi sontes, qualis exercita in Ananiam, etc.*” (Grotius, following Chrysostom and Theophylact, comp. also David Schulz). They are in general—excluding, however, the cures already assigned to a special gift—*miraculous works* (comp. Acts iv. 30), which, as the effects of a will endowed with miraculous power, may be very various according to the different occasions which determined its action (2 Cor. xii. 12 ; Heb. ii. 4 ; also Rom. xv. 19). Instances of raising the dead belonged likewise to this division.³ — *προφητεία] prophetic speech, i.e.* address flowing from revelation and impulse of the Holy Spirit, which, without being bound for that matter to a specific office, suddenly (xiv. 30) unveils the depth of the human heart (xiv. 25) and of the divine counsels (iii. 10 ; Eph. iii. 5), and thereby works with peculiar power for the enlightenment, admonition, and comforting of the faithful (xiv. 3), and so as to win over the unbelieving (xiv. 24). As respects the substance of what he utters, the prophet is distinguished from the speaker with tongues by this, that the latter utters prayers only (see below) ; and as respects form, by the fact that the prophet speaks intelligibly, not in an ecstatic way, consequently not without the exercise of reflective thought ; he differs from the *διδάσκαλος* thus : *ὁ μὲν προφητεύων πάντα ἀπὸ τοῦ πνεύματος φθέγγεται· ὁ δὲ διδάσκων ἐστὶν ὅπου καὶ ἐξ οἰκείας διανοίας διαλέγεται*, Chrysostom on ver. 28. Comp. generally on Acts xi. 27. Lücke, *Einl. in*

¹ “*Ardentissima et praesentissima apprehensio Dei in ipsius potissimum voluntate, ad effectus vel in naturae vel in gratiae regno singulariter conspicuos.*”—BENGEL.

² As Baur rationalizes all these *charismata*: *πίστις* being, according to him, a peculiarly strong faith in *Divine Providence*; the *χάρισμα ἰαμάτων* being the gift of *praying* with special power and fervency for the sick, with more or less confident *promise* of

recovery, if it please God ; and the *ἐνεργήμ. δυνάμ.* being proofs of extraordinary mental fortitude and energy in the interests of Christianity.

³ But not instances of the casting out of demons (Weiss, *bibl. Theol.* p. 410), which are to be placed under the category of the *ιάματα* (comp. Matt. xv. 28 ; Luke vi. 17, ix. 42 ; Acts x. 38).

d. Offenb. Joh. p. 29. Güder in Herzog's *Encyklop.* XII. p. 210. f. — διακρίσεις πνευμ.] *judgments of spirits, i.e.* judgments which avail, and that immediately on hearing the utterances, for the preservation of the church from misleading influences, by informing it from what spirits the utterances proceeded, and by whom they were carried on in the different cases (hence the plural διακρίσεις), whether consequently the Holy Spirit, or the human spirit merely, or even demoniac spirits (1 Tim. iv. 1 ; 1 John iv. 1) were at work ; καὶ γὰρ πολλὰ τότε τῶν ψευδοπροφητῶν ἦν διαφορὰ, τοῦ διαβόλου φιλονεικοῦντος παρυνποστῆσαι τῇ ἀληθείᾳ τὸ ψεῦδος, Chrysostom. Respecting διάκρισις, comp. on Rom. xiv. 1. — γένη γλωσσῶν] The γλώσσαις λαλεῖν in Corinth was identical with that mentioned in Acts x. 46 and xix. 6, identical also with the speaking at Pentecost, Acts ii., according to its *historical* substance (see on Acts, *loc. cit.*), although not according to the form preserved by *tradition* in Luke's account, which had made it a speaking in foreign languages, and so a miracle of a quite peculiar kind. Most commentators, indeed, following Origen and the Fathers generally (with exceptions, however, as early as Irenaeus and Tertullian), have taken γλῶσσαι in this passage also as meaning *foreign languages* (so Storr, Flatt, Heydenreich, Schulthess, Schrader, Rückert, Ch. F. Fritzsche, Maier), and that, too, in the view of the majority, *unacquired* languages ;¹ only a few (among the most recent of whom are Schulthess, *de charismatib. Sp. St.*, Lips. 1818, and Schrader, also Ch. F. Fritzsche in his *Nov. Opusc.* p. 302 ff.) regarding them as *acquired by learning*.² The former view is held also by Rückert ("the faculty, in isolated moments of high inspiration, of praising God in languages which they had not previously learned") and Baeumlein in the *Stud. d. evangelischen Geistlichkeit Würtemb.* VI. 2, 1834, pp. 30–123 ; Oslander ; Kling in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1839, p. 487 ff. ; to some extent Olshausen and Bauer in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1843, p. 658 ff. ; 1844, p. 708 ff. See, in opposition to it, especially Bleek in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1829, p. 17 f. ; Bauer in the *Tübing. Zeitschr.* 1830, 2, p. 104 ff. ; Schulz, *Geistesgaben*, p. 57 ff. ; Zeller, *Apostelgesch.* p. 89 ff. ; van Hengel, *de Gave der talen*, Leiden 1864, p. 90 ff.

¹ So, too, Zinsler, *de charism.* τοῦ γλ. λαλεῖν, Aug. Vind. 1847,—a Roman Catholic prize-essay which obtained the prize, but is destitute of all scientific worth. Of a much more thorough description is another successful prize-essay (also Roman Catholic), by Englmann, *von den charismen*, etc., Mainz 1848, who explains it in the same way of foreign languages ; as also Froschammer, *Charismen*, 1850 ; and Maier, *Die Glossolalie des apost. Zeitalt.* 1855.

² Ch. F. Fritzsche's view is : At Corinth, as in seaport towns generally, there were labourers, fishers, etc., who, from their intercourse with foreign sailors, had become so far acquainted with different languages as to be able to converse about matters of ordinary life. Many of these people had become Christians, and having now learned

that it had been predicted by the prophets that in the Messianic times the Holy Spirit would bring about a speaking concerning divine things in strange tongues (Isa. xxviii. 11 f. ; Joel iii.), they had accordingly applied this oracle to themselves, "quos pro sua, licet tenui, exterarum linguarum peritia prae ceteris idoneos putassent, quos Spiritus s. barbaris linguis de rebus divinis disserere juberet." Since, however, most of the Christians did not understand this speaking in strange tongues, there had to be an interpretation into Greek, and the interpreters in their turn not less than the speakers, regarded their ability as flowing from the Holy Spirit. So it all resolves itself into naive self-deception and imagination !

Even putting out of account the *singular* expression γλώσση λαλεῖν, which is supposed to refer to a *foreign* language, and the psychological impossibility¹ of speaking languages *which had not been learned*, the following considerations tell decidedly against the view of foreign languages : (1) It would make xiv. 2 untrue in all cases in which persons were found among the audience who understood the languages spoken. (2) In xiv. 10, 11 we have the γένη φωνῶν (*languages*) expressly distinguished from the γένη γλωσσῶν (see unfounded objections to this in Baeumlein, p. 92, and in Hofmann), and the former adduced as an *analogue* of the latter. (3) What is contrasted with the *glossolalia* is not speaking in one's native tongue, but speaking with employment of the understanding (xiv. 15) ; and the *glossolalia* itself is characterized as λαλεῖν πνεύματι. (4) In xiv. 6 there is contrasted with the γλῶσσ. λαλεῖν the speaking ἐν ἀποκαλύψει, ἐν γνώσει κ.τ.λ., which could all, of course, be done in *any* language ; hence the unintelligibleness of the *glossolalia* is not to be sought in the *idiom*, but in the fact that what was spoken contained neither ἀποκάλυψις nor γνώσις, etc. (5) Upon this theory, the case supposed in xiv. 28 could not have occurred at all, since every speaker would have been able also to interpret. (6) In xiv. 18 Paul states that he himself possessed the *glossolalia* in a high degree, but adds that he did not exercise it in the church,—from which it would follow that Paul was in the habit of praying in private, before God, in foreign languages ! (7) In xiv. 9, διὰ τῆς γλώσσης plainly means *by the tongue*, which, however, would be a quite superfluous addition if the point were not one concerning speaking with *tongues* (not with *languages*). (8) Paul would have discussed the whole subject of the χάρισμα in question from quite another point of view, namely, according to the presence or non-presence of those who understood foreign languages. Billroth therefore is right in opposing, as we do, the hypothesis of foreign languages ; but he still holds fast the signification *language*, and maintains that the *glossolalia* was “*the speaking of a mixed language, which comprised the elements or rudiments of actual historic languages of the most widely different kinds, and was the type of the universal character of Christianity.*” But to say nothing of the Quixotic arbitrariness of the conception of such a medley, to say nothing also of the fact that the first rudiments of languages must have been only very imperfect, unadapted for supersensuous themes, and wholly unsuitable as a means of expression for ecstatic inspiration—this view is opposed by almost all the considerations adduced against the hypothesis of foreign languages applied with the requisite modifications, and in addition by the phrase γλώσση λαλεῖν without the article ; for the mixed language would surely not have been indefinitely *a language*, but the language κατ' ἐξοχὴν, the primeval speech. Rossteuscher, too (*Gabe d. Sprachen im apost. Zeitalter*, 1850), explains it as *languages*, and infers from xiii. 1 that the *glossolalia* in 1 Cor. was the speaking in *angelic languages* (Acts ii. : in *human* languages), the designation being formed with reference to the characteristic of this mysterious language, that it be-

¹ This is made only the more evident, if we suppose (comp. *e.g.* Kling) that one speaking with tongues could perhaps even

take elements from *very different* languages and join them creatively together in a harmonious combination.

tokened a converse alone with God, such as the angels have. So also, in substance, Thiersch, *Kirche im apost. Zeitalt.* p. 67 f. But this whole conception is shown to be erroneous when we consider that, if the specific characteristic of the phenomenon had been its *angelic* nature, the latter would have found its expression in the very *name* of the thing, and would also have been made mention of by Paul in his certainly pretty minute discussion of the subject ; whereas, on the contrary, in xiii. 1 a speaking *ταῖς γλώσσαις τῶν ἀγγέλων* is only *supposed* as an *imaginary* case to heighten the contrast. Generally, however, the explanations which make it a *speaking in a language or languages*, are incompatible with the whole account of it which follows, even if we try to represent to ourselves the phenomenon and the designation as Hofmann does. According to him, the question is regarding languages spoken by the speaker only in virtue of his being carried away by the Holy Spirit, the distinctions between which, however, were not to be considered as differences between the language of one nation and another, but arose out of this, that the Holy Spirit gave impulse and power to the speaker to make his language for himself for what he had to utter at that very moment, so that the language moulded itself specially in the mouth of each individual respectively for that which had to be uttered. Those expositors who departed from the signification *language* entered on the right path.¹ But that by itself was not enough to bring them to what was positively the right meaning. For Bleek in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1829, pp. 3–79, 1830, p. 43 ff., explains it as *glosses*, i.e. *antique, highly poetic words and formulae to some extent consisting of provincialisms*. This view is equally opposed by most of the considerations which tell against the foreign languages, as well as by xiii. 1 ; and further, it has against it the fact that γλ. in the above sense is a *terminus technicus* which occurs, indeed, after Aristotle, although for the most part in grammarians, but which the New Testament writers probably did not so much as know ; and also the consideration that the singular γλῶσση λαλεῖν, γλῶσσαν ἔχειν, γλῶσση προσεύχεσθαι, as well as the expression γλῶσσαι ἀγγέλων, would be quite absurd. See further, Baur, *loc. cit.* p. 85 ff. (who, however, in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1838, p. 618 ff., has come over in substance to Bleek's view) ; Schulz, *loc. cit.* p. 20 ff., and in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1839, p. 752 ff. ; Wieseler in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1838, p. 723 ff. ; Hilgenfeld, *Glossolalie*, 1850, p. 28 ff. The result of all this is, that there is only the signification *tongue* remaining for γλῶσσα, so that γλῶσσαις λαλεῖν expresses *an uttering oneself with tongues*. This is not, however, to be taken as justifying the extreme view of Bardili (*significatus primitiv. vocis προφητ.*, etc., Gott. 1786) and Eichhorn (*Biblioth.* I. pp. 91 ff., 775 ff. ; II. p. 755 ff. ; III. p. 322 ff.), according to which what is meant is a *lispings of inarticulate tones* ;² for such a strange form of expression for inspiration,

¹ Luther too, up to 1528, had "tongues," but from that date onwards has "languages." In chap. xiv., however, he has still "tongues" in 1545.

² Wieseler approached nearest to this view, understanding "an ecstatic speaking in unintelligible expressions, i.e. in soft,

scarcely audible, inarticulate words, tones and sounds, in which inspired pious feeling found vent" (*Stud. u. Krit.* 1838, p. 738). The same writer, however, has more recently (see *Stud. u. Krit.* 1860, p. 113 ff.) modified his view to this extent, that he now explains the ecstatic soft praying as being only one

for which Paul would hardly have given thanks to God,—such a *play* of spiritual utterance as would hardly have made any certain charismatic exposition possible,—must have been clearly presented by the text, in order, despite these considerations, to warrant its assumption. Comp. on Acts ii. But the text characterizes the speaking in tongues as utterance of prayer (xiv. 13–17) in which the *νοῦς* falls into the background, and therefore unintelligible without interpretation. There must thus, certainly, have been a want of connection, since the reflective faculty was absent which regulates and presents clearly the conceptions; there may even have been inarticulateness in it, sometimes in a greater, sometimes in a less degree; but must it on this account have been a mere babbling? May it not have been a speaking in ecstatic ejaculations, abrupt ascriptions of praise to God, and other mysterious outbursts in prayer of the highest strain of inspiration? Baur, too, *loc. cit.*, agrees in substance with this;¹ as also Steudel in the *Tüb. Zeitschr.* 1830, 2, p. 135 ff.; Neander; Kuntze in the *theol. Mitarb.* 1840, p. 119 ff.; Olshausen (who, however, takes *γλ.* as *languages*, and holds himself obliged, on the ground of Acts ii., to include also the use of foreign languages); de Wette; Delitzsch, *Psychol.* p. 362 f.; Zeller in the *theol. Jahrb.* 1849, 1, p. 43, and *Apostelgesch.* p. 111. Comp. too, Ewald, *Jahrb.* III. p. 270 ff., who, however, derives from the speaking with tongues the *ἁββὰ ὁ πατήρ*, which is in itself so intelligible, and which does not presuppose any high inspiration, and the unutterable sighings, Rom. viii. 26, which do not belong to the sphere of the *λαλεῖν*. Similarly van Hengel, p. 105, who, again, conceives the original *glossolalia* (“*open-hearted and loud speaking to the glorifying of God in Christ*,” see on Acts ii.) to have become so degenerate and abused by the Corinthians, that it was now “*a spiritless counterfeit, a product of pride and vanity*,” and so no longer to the glory of God in Christ,—an assumption which leaves it unexplained why Paul should not have denounced an abuse of this kind in the severest way, and how he could even place his own speaking with tongues upon the same level with that of the Corinthians. Hilgenfeld, who understands it to mean language of immediate divine suggestion (“*divine tongues, spirit-voices from a higher world*”), is not disposed to keep distinct from each other the two meanings of *γλῶσσα*, *tongue* and *language* (so also Zeller, Delitzsch, and others), although Paul himself keeps them distinct in xiv. 10 f. Schulz limits the conception too narrowly to ascriptions of praise to God,² since, in

special *γένος γλωσσῶν*, no longer making it the universal form of all speaking with tongues, and in other respects agreeing in substance with our interpretation. But there is nothing in the whole section to lead to the idea of even a *soft kind* of *glossolalia*; on the contrary, the comparisons, in particular, with the flute, lyre, trumpet, and cymbal, as well as with foreign languages, are decidedly against this. A soft lisping might run along with it, but was assuredly no special *γένος γλωσσῶν*.

¹ Comp. also Weiss, *bibl. Theol.* p. 410.

² The result of his investigation is presented by Schulz, p. 160, as follows: “The extraordinary excitement of mind, which at times possessed believers in Christ in the primitive church at the thought of the salvation now manifested in Christ, of the blessedness of God’s chosen children now realized after the fulfilment of his earlier promises, and which, under certain circumstances, rose even to ecstasy, was itself regarded as a special gracious gift of the Godhead, and since no nearer means of explanation offered itself, as an immediate oper-

fact, xiv. 13-17 shows that it included prayer, praise, and thanksgiving. We are accordingly to understand by γλώσσαις λαλεῖν *such an outburst of prayer in petition, praise, and thanksgiving, as was so ecstatic that in connection with it the speaker's own conscious intellectual activity was suspended, while the tongue did not serve as the instrument for the utterance of self-active reflection, but, independently of it, was involuntarily set in motion by the Holy Spirit, by whom the man in his deepest nature was seized and borne away.*¹ As regards this matter, it is conceivable—(1) that the abeyance of the νοῦς made this λαλεῖν so disconnected and mysterious for hearers who were bound to the conditions of the νοῦς, that it could not be understood by them without ἐρμηνεία. Incomprehensible sounds, partly sighing, partly jubilant cries, broken words, expressions new in their form and connection, in which the deepest emotion struggled to express itself, and in whatever other ways the tongue might give utterance to the highest surgings and heavings of the Spirit,—it remained unfruitful for others, if no interpretation was added, like a foreign language not understood. Equally conceivable is it (2) that in such utterances of prayer, the tongue, because speaking independently of the νοῦς, apparently spoke *of itself*,² although it was in reality the organ of the Holy Spirit. It was not the *I* of the man that spoke, but the *tongue*,—so the case *seemed* to be, and so arose its *designation*. But (3) because that ecstatic kind of prayer showed itself under very different characteristic modifications (which we doubtless, from want of experience of them, are not in a position to establish), and the same speaker with tongues must, according to the varying degrees, impulses, and tendencies of his ecstasy, have expressed himself in manifold ways which could be easily distinguished from each other, so that he appeared to speak with different tongues, there arose both the plural expression γλώσσαις λαλεῖν and the mode of view which led

ation of the Holy Spirit. Every one therefore willingly yielded himself to such an exaltation of spirit, and had no scruple in giving vent to his joy of soul by joyous and jubilant tones, shouting aloud the praises of God in song, partly in old and familiar strains, partly in newly formed ones, without any concern for the fact that in this way he might easily fall into boundless extravagances, improprieties, and troubles. *This singing of praise to God, arising in and from that condition of ecstasy,—these triumphant, loud-sounding strains of jubilation (not the condition of ecstasy itself), are in our judgment what is denoted by the formulas γλώσση and γλώσσαις λαλεῖν.*"

¹ In the ancient church we have, as analogies to the *glossolalia*, to some extent (Ritschl, *altkath. K.* p. 473 ff.) the *Montanistic* ecstasies (see Schwegler, *Montanism*, p. 83 ff.; Hilgenfeld, *Glossolalie*, p. 115 ff.; comp. Lücke *Einl. in d. Apokal.* I. p. 324, ed. 2); in modern times, the ecstatic discourses of the French and German *inspired ones* (Goebel in the *Zeitschr. f. histor. Theol.* 1854,

p. 287 ff.), as well as the *Irvingite* speaking with tongues (Hohl, *Bruchstücke aus d. Leben Irv.*, St. Gallen 1839, *evangel. Kirchenzeit.* 1839, No. 54 f.; 1839, No. 88 f.; Reich in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1849, p. 195 ff.), and ecstatic incidents at Revivals and among the American Methodists (Fabri, *d. neuesten Erweckungen in America*, etc., 1860); as likewise glossolalic phenomena, which are narrated of clairvoyants (Delitzsch, *Psychol.* p. 364 f.). But earlier still we have another analogue in Philo's conception of the divinely inspired speaking of the prophets; the prophet only *seems* to speak himself, καταχρήται δὲ ἕτερος αὐτοῦ τοῖς φωνητηρίοις ὀργάνοις, στόματι καὶ γλώττῃ πρὸς μὲνυσιν ὧν ἂν θέλῃ (*quid rer. div. haer.* I. p. 510, Mang.).—Regarding the essential difference of *somnambulist* phenomena, which may be compared with the speaking with tongues, see Delitzsch, *Psychol. loc. cit.*—There is not the remotest ground for thinking of an *ecclesiastical secret language* (Redslob, *Apokal.* I. 1859).

² The tongue was not γλώσσα ὑπήκοος τῷ λογισμῷ, Plut. *Mor.* p. 90 B.

men to distinguish γένη γλωσσῶν.¹ — ἐρμηνεία γλωσσ.] *Interpretation of tongues*, i.e. *a making of tongues intelligible in speaking*, a presentation of the sense of what they say.² The condition for this was the capacity of the νοῦς, produced by the Spirit, to receive what was prayed for in *glossolalia*. The man speaking with tongues *might* himself (xiv. 5–13) have the χάρισμα of the interpreter (comp. the classical ὑποφήτης), but did not *always* have it himself alone, as Wieseler also now admits (*Stud. u. Krit.* 1860, p. 117) in opposition to his own earlier view. (z¹).

Ver. 11. Amid all this diversity, however, what unity of the operative principle ! — ἐνεργεῖ] namely, as the divine power endowing the different individuals differently. See what follows. Διάφοροι μὲν οἱ κροννοὶ, μία δὲ πάντως πηγὴ, Theodoret. — ἰδίᾳ] seorsim, *severally*. See Bernhardt, p. 185. Comp. Plato, *Menex.* p. 249 B : ἅπερ ἰδίᾳ ἐκάστῳ ἰδία γίγνεται. Pind. *Nem.* iii. 42 ; and very often in classical writers. Elsewhere in the N. T. : κατ' ἰδίαν. — καθὼς βούλεται] not : *arbitrarily*, but (comp. on Matt. i. 19) : *in accordance with the determination of His will*, which by no means precludes this divine self-determining action of the Holy Spirit from proceeding in a manner corresponding to the natural and general Christian capacity, and to the peculiar disposition and tendency of the minds, of men. Hence, on the one hand, the possibility that, from the human side, particular charismata may be *obtained by effort*, ver. 31, xiv. 1 ; and also, on the other hand, the duty of not estimating slightly the gifts of others. Observe, further, in καθὼς βούλεται the *personality* of the Spirit.

Ver. 12. Illustration of how one and the same Spirit works all the charismata as He will ; namely, just as the case stands *with the body*, that its many members make up its unity, so also does it stand in like manner *with Christ*, whose many members likewise constitute the unity of His body.

¹ Baur, in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1838, p. 628 ff., professes himself, so far as the *plural* expression γλώσσαις λαλεῖν is concerned, an adherent of Bleek's theory, which in other respects he impugns, with two limitations, however (see p. 636) : (1) that we are not to connect with γλώσσαι the conception of a poetic, inspired mode of speech ; and (2) that Bleek's explanation is not to be applied to the passages in the Acts. According to Baur, it is "*a speaking in strange, unusual phrases which deviate from the prevailing usage of the language.*" The pressure of the overpowering feeling, which strove for expression, called to its aid these forms of speech, which were partly borrowed from foreign languages, partly at least not in use in the ordinary language of common life. These forms of speech were, according to him, the γλώσσαι, and the γλώσσαις λαλεῖν was an intensified γλώσση λαλ. But if γλώσσα, both in its singular and plural form, is to mean *tongue* (see p. 622), then γλώσσαι (the plural) cannot at the same time mean *utterances* of the tongue, *peculiarities of language* (see p.

634 f.).—The different explanations of γένη γλ. may be easily known from the different views of the nature of the χάρισμα in itself. Those interpreters, *e.g.*, who understand γλώσσαι of foreign languages, think of the *variety of languages* (Chrysostom on ver. 1 : ὁ μὲν τῇ Περσῶν, ὁ δὲ τῶν Ῥωμαίων, ὁ δὲ τῇ Ἰνδῶν, ὁ δὲ τῇ ἑτέρᾳ τινι τοιαύτῃ εὐθέως ἐφθέγγετο γλώσση) ; Eichhorn : "all sorts of unintelligible tones ;" Schulz : "many various strains of divinely inspired songs of praise ;" Wieseler (1838) : the inarticulate lisping itself, *with* and *without* its interpretation ; Rossteuscher : "human and angelic languages," xiii. 1 ; Hilgenfeld : different kinds of divinely suggested speech ; Hofmann : all the different sorts of peculiar forms of the language in the mouth of each individual.

² How the ancient interpreters conceived of *this* χάρισμα, may be seen, *e.g.*, in Theodoret : ἀνὴρ γὰρ πολλάκις τὴν Ἑλλάδα γλώτταν μόνην εἰδῶς, ἑτέρου τὴν Σκυθῶν καὶ Θρακῶν διαλεγόμενον, τὴν ἐρμηνείαν προσέφερε τοῖς ἀκούουσι.

Ὁ Χριστός is not the *Christian church*, but *Christ Himself*, inasmuch, that is to say, as He, as the *Head* of the church, has in its many members His organic body,¹ which receives forth from Him, the Head, the whole harmonious connection and efficiency of all its members and its growth. Christ is not conceived as the *Ego* of the church as His body (Hofmann), but as in all parallel expressions of the apostle (see especially Eph. iv. 16, 25, v. 30 ; Rom. xii. 4 f., and above on vi. 15), as the *Head* of the church, and the church as the *body* of the Head. Ver. 21 does not run counter to this ; see on that passage. — The repetition of τοῦ σώματος, which is superfluous in itself, or might have been represented by αὐτοῦ (comp. Lobeck, *ad Aj.* p. 222, ed. 2 ; Kühner, *ad Xen. Anab.* i. 7. 11), serves here emphatically to bring out the unity.

Ver. 13. Confirmation of this unity from the holy *inward* relation which conditions it. *For even by means of one Spirit were we all baptized into one body*—i.e. for even by this, that we received one and the same Holy Spirit at our baptism, were we all to be bound together into one ethical body. Comp. Titus iii. 5. — In καί, which belongs to ἐν ἐνὶ πν., is conveyed the indication of the relation *corresponding* to what was spoken of in ver. 12 ; ἐβαπτίσθη., again, is not to be taken *tropically*, as is done by Reiche also (“de Spiritu sancto largiter nobis collato”), following Venema, Michaelis, Rosenmüller, Krause, Flatt, and admitting only an *allusion* to baptism ; but, as the word itself must have suggested to the reader, of the *actual baptism*, only in such a way that by ἐν ἐνὶ πνεύματι it was to be brought prominently before the mind from its *spiritual* side, according to its *materia coelestis*, in so far as it was a baptism of the *Spirit*. Comp. Hofmann also, now in opposition to his own *Schriftbew.* II. 2, p. 28. This βαπτισθῆναι ἐν ἐνὶ πνεύματι has taken place εἰς ἐν σῶμα, *in reference to one body* (Matt. xxviii. 19 ; Rom. vi. 3 ; 1 Cor. x. 2), i.e. it had as its destination that we should all now make up one body. Regarding εἴτε Ἰουδαῖοι κ.τ.λ., comp. Gal. iii. 28 ; Col. iii. 11. — The *second hemistich* does not begin already with εἴτε Ἰουδαῖοι κ.τ.λ., in which case καί before πάντες would be only in the way (comp. also iii. 22 ; Col. i. 16), but starts only from καὶ πάντες, so that the reception of the one Spirit at baptism is once again declared with emphasis. The reference to *baptism* was correctly made by as early commentators as Chrysostom,² Oecumenius, Theophylact ; in recent times, by Rückert, Baur, de Wette, Ewald, Maier, Hofmann : *and we were all given to drink of one Spirit* (comp. Ecclus. xv. 3). To represent the *communication* of the Spirit which took place at baptism as a *giving to drink*, followed naturally from the conception of the *pouring out* of the Spirit,³ John vii. 37 ff. ; Acts ii. 17 ; Rom. v. 5 ; and is here, after being already mentioned with ἐν ἐνὶ πνεύματι, brought forward yet again *independently* and with peculiar *emphasis* as the *inward correlate* of the ἐν σῶμα. This καὶ π. ἐν πν. ἐποτ. refers neither (Augustine,

¹ Comp. Ehrenfeuchter, *prakt. Theol.* I. p. 57 f. ; see also *Constitt. ap.* ii. 59. 1.

² He gives first the explanation referring it to the Lord's Supper, but then goes on : ἐμοὶ δὲ δοκεῖ νῦν ἐκείνην λέγειν πνεύματος τὴν

ἐπιφοίτησιν τὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ βαπτίσματος καὶ πρὸ τῶν μυστηρίων ἐγγινομένην ἡμῖν.

³ Comp. also Isa. xix. 10 : πεπότικεν ὑμᾶς κύριος πνεύματι κατανίξews.

Luther, Beza, Calvin, Estius, Grotius, Calovius, Osiander, Neander, Kahnis, Kling, and many others) to the *Lord's Supper* (most adopting the reading *εἰς ἐν πν.*, which would mean : *in order to make up one Spirit*), nor "to the further *nourishment and training in Christianity* through the Divine Spirit, who constantly renews Himself in every Christian" (Billroth, Olshausen), in connection with which the reference to the Lord's Supper is not excluded. The aorist is against both these interpretations, for its temporal significance must be the same with that of *ἐβαπτ.*, and against the former of them is the reading *ἐν πνεῦμα*¹ (without *εἰς*), by which the reference to the Lord's Supper (see, in opposition to this, Theophylact) is debarred in this way, because the idea that we drink the Holy Spirit in the Lord's Supper is not biblical, not even underlying x. 3 f. See, besides, Weiss, *bibl. Theol.* p. 355. Rückert refers correctly *καί . . . ἐποτ.* to the reception of the Spirit as an event happening once for all, but takes the relation of the two clauses in such a way, that what Paul means to say is, "we are not simply one body, but also one spirit." In that case he would not have written *ἐν ἐνὶ πνεύματι* in the first clause.

Ver. 14 ff. For the further illustration (*γάρ*) of this unity, the figure of the human body is again brought forward in order now to carry it out more minutely, and to show by it in detail on to ver. 26 how preposterous it is to be discontented with the gift received, or to despise those differently gifted. On the whole passage, comp. the speech of Menenius Agrippa in Livy, ii. 32, also Seneca, *de ira*, ii. 31 ; Marc. Anton. ii. 1, vii. 13 ; Clem. *Cor.* I. 37. — *ὅτι οὐκ εἰμὶ χεῖρ*] *because I am not hand, I am not of the body*, do not belong to it. — *οὐ παρὰ τοῦτο κ.τ.λ.*] cannot, with Erasmus,² be taken as a *question* (which Billroth, Rückert, Hofmann, following Bengel and others, rightly rejects), so that the double negative should strengthen the denial : *num ideo non est corporis?* In this case, namely, *οὐ* would only be the ordinary interrogative, which presupposes an affirmative answer ; but as such it can by no means warrant or explain an intensifying repetition. And an anadiplosis of the *οὐ* (Klotz, *ad Devar.* p. 696 f. ; Stallbaum, *ad Plat. Symp.* p. 199 A) would be suitable in an earnest declaratory sentence, but not in such a question as this. We must therefore delete the mark of interrogation, as Lachmann also and Tischendorf have done,³ so as to make *οὐ* serve as a negative for the whole sentence, while the succeeding *οὐκ* applies simply to the *ἔστιν*. We render consequently, *so is he not on that account* (namely, because he asserts it in that discontented expression) *no part of the body* ; that peevish declaration does not do away with what he is, namely, a member of the body. — Regarding *παρὰ* with the accusative in the sense of : *for the sake of, in virtue of, on account of*, see Klausen, *ad Aesch. Choeph.* 383 ; Krüger on *Thuc.* i. 141. 6 ; so often in Demosthenes. By *τοῦτο*⁴ cannot be meant : this, *that it is not the hand* (Billroth and others), but only (comp.

¹ [This reading is adopted by all the recent editors.—T. W. C.]

² Luther, Castalio, Beza, Calvin, and most expositors, including Griesbach, Scholz, Flatt, Schulz, de Wette, Ewald, Maier,

Neander.

³ [Also Westcott and Hort, Stanley, Kling, and Beet so translate.—T. W. C.]

⁴ Comp. *παρὰ τοῦτο*, 4 Macc. x. 19 ; *παρὰ ταῦτα πάντα*, Judith viii. 25.

Hofmann), as the logical relation of the protasis and apodosis requires : this, *that it gives vent to such discontent about its position of not being the hand*, as if it could not regard itself in its capacity of foot as belonging at all to the body. Erasmus in his *Paraphrase* happily describes the temper of the member which spoke in this way as : *deplorans sortem suam.*" — It may be added, that as early an interpreter as Chrysostom has appreciated the fact of Paul's placing together foot and hand, eye and ear, as *analogous* members : ἐπειδὴ γὰρ οὐ τοῖς σφόδρα ὑπερέχουσιν, ἀλλὰ τοῖς ὀλίγον ἀναβεβηκόσι φθονεῖν εἰώθαμεν.

Ver. 17 exposes the preposterous character of the preceding language. — ὀφθαλμός] *sc.* ἦν, ver. 19. — ὀσφρησίς] Plato, *Phaed.* p. 111 B, *the sense of smell.*

Ver. 18. Νυνὶ δέ] *but so, i.e.* but in this way, as the case really stands, has God given to the members their place (ἔθετο), etc. — ἐν ἑκαστον αὐτῶν] is in apposition to τὰ μέλη, and defines it more precisely. — ἠθέλησεν] To this simple *will* of God each member has to submit itself. The thought in καθὼς βούλεται, ver. 11, is different.

Ver. 19 f. *If, on the contrary, the whole of the members, which make up the body, were one member,—if they, instead of their variety, formed one undifferentiated member,—where were the body ?*¹ In that case there would be no body existent, for its essential nature is just the combination of different organs,—a new *abductio ad absurdum.* — *But so* (as ver. 18) *there are indeed many members, but one body.* The antitheses in vv. 18 and 20 manifest, in contradistinction to the perverseness of vain longing after gifts not received, the necessity of the existing relation to the organic and harmonious subsistence and life of the church.

Ver. 21. Hitherto, in vv. 15-20, this figure has been used to rebuke those who were discontented with what they considered their lesser gifts ; we now come to those who were proud of their higher gifts and contemptuous towards the less highly gifted. — οὐ δύναται] of the impossibility conditioned by the indispensableness of the hand for the eye. — πάλιν] as in Matt. iv. 7, v. 33, *again*,—since the case belongs to the same category. Comp. on 2 Cor. x. 7 ; Rom. xv. 10. — ἡ κεφαλὴ] *the head*, consequently the part of the body which stands highest, compared with the feet, the members that stand lowest. That Paul, in his specializing representation, has in view *simply* the corporeal members *as such*, and therefore introduces the *head* also upon the scene with the rest, without in any way thereby touching upon the idea of Christ as the Head of the church (comp. on ver. 12), is plain from the whole picture, which, in its concrete details, is as far as possible from giving occasion to allegorical interpretations of the several parts of the body.

Vv. 22, 23. No ; the relationship of the members is, on the contrary, of a different sort ; those accounted *weaker* are *necessary* ; likewise those held to be *less honourable* are the *more honourably attired* ; those which are *unseemly* are invested with all the greater *seemliness*. What *particular* members Paul specially meant here by the *weak* (Theodoret, Estius, and several others

¹ [That is, what would become of the organization of the body as a whole?—T. W. C.]

hold: the brain and inward organs; Hofmann: "the delicate inward parts;" Bengel: the hands; most commentators, including Billroth: the eyes and ears) and by the ἀτιμοτέροις (*usually*: the feet; Grotius and Calovius: "venter cum iis quae sub ventre sunt;" Kypke: the intestines) cannot be definitely settled in detail, since he only says in a summary way: "How contrary it is to the natural relation of the members, if one were to say to the other (as in the preceding illustration the eye to the hand, or the head to the feet), I have no need of thee! Such contemptuous treatment can find no warrant either in the weakness, or the less honourable character, or the unseemliness of any member; for the members which we count weak are shielded from depreciation by their necessity; those held less honourable, by their more honourable dress; and those which are unseemly, by their seemly covering." Since, however, it is of itself undoubted that he reckoned the *pudenda* (τὰ αἰδοῖα) and the *breech* among the ἀσχήμονα, we may further, without arbitrariness, set down the delicate organs of sense, such as the *eye and ear*, among the ἀσθενέστερα, and among the ἀτιμότερα again the members specially cared for in the way of adornment by dress, such as the trunk, hips, and shoulders. (A²) — πολλῶ μᾶλλον] the logical *multo potius*. — τὰ δοκοῦντα] *which appear*, like ἡ δοκοῦμεν, ver. 23. Chrysostom aptly says, that what is conveyed is not τῆς φύσεως τῶν πραγμάτων, but τῆς τῶν πολλῶν ὑπονοίας ἡ ψῆφος. The *position* is, as in Plato, *Rep.* p. 572 B, καὶ πάνν δοκοῦσιν ἡμῶν ἐνίοις μετρίους εἶναι. Comp. p. 334 C. — The first καὶ in ver. 23 subjoins another category, the two members of which are put in order of climax (ἀτιμότ., ἀσχήμ.). — ἀτιμότερα εἶναι τοῦ σώμ.] *to be more dishonourable parts of the body*, than others; "comparativus molliens," Bengel. — τιμὴν περισσ.] *honour in richer measure* than others, namely, *by the clothing*, which is indicated by περιτίθ. (Matt. xxvii. 28; Gen. xxvii. 16; Esth. i. 20; Prov. xii. 9; 2 Macc. xi. 13, xii. 39, xxiii. 32; Hom. *Il.* iii. 330, xiv. 187). — τὰ ἀσχήμ. ἡμ.] *our unseemly parts*. Theodore of Mopsuestia says well: ἀσχήμονα ὡς πρὸς τὴν κοινὴν ὄψιν ἀποκαλεῖ. Notice, too, that we have not here again the milder relative comparative. — ἔχει] *They have* greater seemliness than others; it becomes their *own*, namely, through the more seemly covering in which they are attired. On the purport of the verse, Chrysostom remarks rightly: τί γὰρ τῶν μορίων τῶν γεννητικῶν ἀτιμότερον ἐν ἡμῖν εἶναι δοκεῖ; ἀλλ' ὁμως πλείονος ἀπολαύει τιμῆς, καὶ οἱ σφόδρα πένητες, κὰν τὸ λοιπὸν γυμνὸν ἔχωσι σῶμα, οὐκ ἂν ἀνάσχοιντο ἐκεῖνα τὰ μέλη δεῖξαι γυμνά. According to Hofmann, we are to supply τοῦ σώματος from what goes before in connection with τὰ ἀσχήμ.; the words from ἡμῶν to ἔχει, again, are to be taken as: *they bring with them a greater seemliness* (a more seemly demeanour) *on our part*. Needless artificial, and contrary to the τὰ τὲ εὐσχήμ. ἡμῶν which follows.

Ver. 24. Τὰ δὲ εὐσχήμ. ἡμ. οὐ χρ. ἔχ.] which should be separated from what precedes it only by a comma, is not designed *to set aside an objection* (Chrysostom, Theophylact), but it appertains to the *completeness* of the subject that, after the ἀσχήμονα have been spoken of, the remark in question should be added regarding the εὐσχήμονα also, in order to let nothing be wanting in the exhibition of the *adjustment* which takes place in connection with the variety of relation subsisting between the members. Εὐσχημοσύνην περισσ.

ἔχειν naturally supplies itself from the foregoing context to οὐ χρεῖαν ἔχει. All the less ground is there for connecting ἡμῶν with οὐ χρ. ἔχ. (Hofmann, comp. Osiander), which would give the thought: *they stand in no need of us*, which is too general, and which would still need to be limited again by what precedes it — ἀλλ' ὁ Θεὸς κ.τ.λ.] cannot be antithesis to the foregoing negative (Hofmann), which would bring the special subordinate thought οὐ χρεῖαν ἔχει into a connection quite disproportionately grand and far transcending it. There should, on the contrary, be a full stop placed before ἀλλ', so as to mark the beginning of a *new* sentence; and ἀλλ' rather *breaks off* (at, see Baeumlein, *Partik.* p. 15) the delineation of the mutual relations of the members, which has been hitherto given, in order now to raise the readers to the higher point of view from which this relationship is to be regarded, that of the *divine appointment and destination*. — συνεκέρασε] *He has mingled together, i.e.* united into one whole out of differently constituted parts. — τῷ ὑστεροῦντι] *to that which stands after, remaining back* behind others, i. 7, viii. 8; Plato, *Pol.* vii. p. 539 E, *Epin.* p. 987 D (see also on Matt. xix. 20), *i.e.* to the part which, according to human estimation, is meaner than others.¹ — περισσ. δοῦς τιμ.] δούς is *contemporaneous* with συνεκέρασε: *so that* He gave, namely, when He granted to them, according to vv. 22, 23, respectively their greater necessity and the destination of being clad in a more honourable and more seemly way.

Ver. 25. Σχίσμα] *i.e.* *disunion*, such as is vividly represented by way of example in ver. 21. — ἀλλὰ τὸ αὐτὸ κ.τ.λ.] in order that, on the contrary, there may be one and the same interest, to which the members mutually direct their care for each other. Comp. Liv. *loc. cit.* What Paul has in view in the τὸ αὐτό, which he so emphatically puts first, may be gathered from the ὑπὲρ ἀλλήλων, namely, the welfare of every other member. Comp. ver. 26. The *plural* μεριμνῶσι with the neuter noun is to be explained from the *distributive* sense (Kühner, *ad Xen. Mem.* iv. 3. 12); in ver. 26, on the other hand, the *totality* of the members is expressed.

Ver. 26. And how perfectly is this design of God realized in the mutual sympathy of the members! This happy result of the divine appointment stands most suitably here at the close of the whole discussion before the application ensues in ver. 27, although Hofmann denies the connection of thought. — δοξάζεται] *is glorified*, which may take place practically by flourishing growth, by adornment, dress, anointing, and the like, and further by recognition of its usefulness, beauty, strength, dexterity, and so forth. — In view of the sympathy of the whole organism, and in consideration of the personifying style of the description, the concrete literal sense of the verse ought by no means to be modified.

Ver. 27. Application of all that is said of the human body (vv. 14-26) to

¹ In how far, is stated in vv. 22, 23. By a very arbitrary importation of ideas, Hofmann holds that τὸ ὑστεροῦν means the *loins and genitals*, a part of the body which, while falling behind the rest in honour, is distinguished by the honour of *serving*

for the self-propagation of man. Neither that specific reference in itself, nor this more precise definition of the greater honour referred to,—out of place as it is in this connection,—could ever have been guessed by a reader from ver. 22 f.

his readers : *now ye are* (in order now to apply *to you* what has been hitherto said, you then are) *the body of Christ and members proportionately*. In each Christian church the (ideal) body of Christ presents itself, as in each is presented the (ideal) temple of God ; but each church is not a separate body of Christ ; hence, just as with the idea of the temple (see on iii. 16), we must keep entirely away from us the conception of a plurality, as if the churches were σώματα Χριστοῦ, and understand σῶμα Χριστοῦ not as *a body*,¹ but as *body* of Christ, the expression without the article being *qualitative*. — Now if the church, as a whole, is Christ's *body*, then the individuals in it are Christ's *members* (comp. vi. 15), but this *not without distinction*, as if every one could be any member ; but ἐκ μέρους, *according to parts*, according as each one respectively has his own definite part in the body of Christ, consequently his especial place and function which have fallen to him *pro parte* in the collective organism of the church. Ἐκ betokens the accompanying circumstance of the fact, Bernhardt, p. 230 ; the expression, however, does not stand here as in xiii. 9, 10, 12, in contrast to that which is *perfect* (Hofmann), but, as the context shows, in contrast to the united *whole*, the κοινόν comp. ἐκάστου μέρους, Eph. iv. 16. Luther puts it well, as regards the essential meaning : “each one according to his part.” Comp. Calvin. Other interpreters understand, with Grotius (who explains it like οἱ κατὰ μέρους) : *si ex partibus fit aestimatio*, considered as individuals. So Billroth, Rückert, Ewald, Maier. But what would be the object of this superfluous definition ? That μέλη refers to individuals, is surely self-evident. Chrysostom held that the Corinthian church was thereby designated as part of the church universal. So also Theodoret, Theophylact, Beza, Wolf, Bengel, and others. But a glance at other churches was entirely alien from the apostle's purpose here.

Ver. 28. More precise elucidation of the ἐκ μέρους, and that in respect of those differently gifted and with extension of the view so as to take in the *whole church* ; hence Paul adds ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, and thereby averts (against Hofmann's objection) the misunderstanding of καί (which is to be taken as *and indeed*), as if there had been *Corinthian* apostles. — Regarding ἐθετο, comp. Acts xx. 28. — οὗς μὲν] *certain ones*. In beginning thus, Paul had it in mind to make οὗς δέ follow after ; but in the act of writing there occurred to him the thought of the enumeration according to rank (comp. Eph. iv. 11), and so οὗς μὲν was left without any continuation corresponding to it. Afterwards, too, from ἐπειτα onwards, he again abandons this mode of enumeration. Comp. Winer, p. 528 [E. T. 711] ; Buttmann, *neut. Gr.* p. 313 [E. T. 365]. According to Hofmann, μὴ πάντες κ.τ.λ., ver. 29, is meant to form the apodosis of κ. οὗς μὲν κ.τ.λ., so that the subject of πάντες is contained in οὗς : “Those, too, whom God has placed in the church first as apostles . . . are they all apostles, all prophets ?” etc. But οὗς μὲν can be nothing else than the quite common distributive expression, and not equiv-

¹ Baur, too, founds upon the absence of the article, and takes it to mean, “*a body which has the objective ground of its existence in Christ*,” so that the genitive

would be *objecti*. But in *every* place where the body of Christ is spoken of the genitive is *subjecti* ; Paul would in that case have written σῶμα ἐν Χριστῷ (comp. Rom. xii. 4).

alent to οὗτοι μὲν, οὗς, as Hofmann would have it (appealing inappropriately to Isocr., *Paneg.* 15); and the proposition itself, that those appointed by God to this or that specific function have not also collectively (?) all other functions, would be in fact so self-evident, and the opposite conception so monstrous, that the apostle's discourse would resolve itself into an absurdity. — ἐν τῇ ἐκκλ.] The Christian church generally, not simply the Corinthian, is meant, as is proved by ἀποστ.; comp. Eph. i. 22; Phil. iii. 6, *al.* — ἀποστόλους] in the wider sense, not merely of the Twelve, but also of those messengers of the Messianic kingdom appointed immediately by Christ at a later time for all nations, such as Paul himself and probably Barnabas as well, likewise James the Lord's brother. Comp. on xv. 7. The apostles had the *whole fulness of the Spirit*, and could therefore work as prophets, teachers, healers of the sick, etc., but not conversely could the prophets, teachers, etc., be also apostles, because they had only the special gifts for the offices in question. — προφήτ.] See on ver. 10. — διδασκάλους] These had the gift of the Holy Spirit for preaching the gospel in the way of intellectual development of its teaching. Comp. on ver. 10 and Acts xiii. 1; Eph. iv. 11.¹ — δυνάμεις] *sc.* ἔθετο, *i.e.* He instituted a category of spiritual gifts, which consists of *miraculous powers*. Paul does not designate the *persons* endowed with such powers (Hofmann, who appeals for support to Acts viii. 10, and compares the names of the orders of angels), but, as the following particulars show, his discourse passes here into the abstract form; by no means, however, because there were no concrete representatives of the things referred to (Billroth, Rückert), but probably because variations of this kind, even without any special occasion for them, are very natural to his vivid style of representation. Comp. Rom. xii. 6–8, where, in the reverse way, he passes from abstracts to concretes. — ἀντιλήψεις] *services of help* (B²) (2 Macc. viii. 19; 3 Macc. v. 50; Ecclus. xi. 12, li. 7; Ezr. viii. 27, *al.*; not so in Greek writers), is most naturally taken, with Chrysostom and most interpreters, of the duties of the *diaconate*, the care of the poor and sick. — κυβερνήσεις] *governments* (Pind. *Pyth.* x. 112; Plut. *Mor.* p. 162 A; comp. also Xen. *Cyr.* i. 1. 5; Polyb. vi. 4. 2; Hist. Susann. 5), is rightly understood by most commentators, according to the meaning of the word, of the work of the *presbyters* (bishops); it refers to their functions of *rule and administration*, in virtue of which they were the *gubernatores ecclesiae*. The (climactic) juxtaposition, too, of ἀντιλήψ. and κυβερν. points to this interpretation. — Regarding γένη γλωσσῶν, see on ver. 10. — The *classification* of all

¹ As Eph. iv. 11 speaks only of the *exercises of teaching activity*, the remaining charismata which are named here found no place there. The *evangelists* specially mentioned, in addition, in that passage were assistants of the apostles, and therefore did not require to be specially adduced here, where the point of view extended further than to the departments of *teaching* merely. The ποιμένες καὶ διδάσκαλοι, Eph. *l.c.*, are *as ποιμένες* included under the κυβερνήσεις. — Observe, further, that the

divine appointment of the persons referred to took place in the case of the apostles, indeed, by an immediate *call* along with the *endowment*, but in the case of the rest by the *endowment*, the emergence of which, in the *standing* services of the church, regulated the *choice* of the churches under the influence and indication of the Holy Spirit (comp. on Acts xx. 28). Comp. also Höfling, *Kirchenverfassung*, p. 272 f., ed. 2, and see on Eph. iv. 11.

the points adduced is as follows : (1) To the *gift of teaching*, the most important of all, belong ἀπόστ., προφ., διδάσκ.; (2) to the *gift of miracles* : δυνάμ., χάρισμα., ἰαματ.; (3) to the gift of *practical administration* τὰς τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν οἰκονομίας, Theodoret : ἀντιλήψ. and κυβερν.; (4) to the *ecstatic χάρισμα* : the γένη γλωσσῶν (see on ver. 10). This *peculiar* character of the last named gift naturally enough brought with it the position at the *end* of the list, without there being any design on Paul's part thereby to oppose the overvaluing of the *glossolalia* (in opposition to Chrysostom, Theodoret, Theophylact, and many others). It is only the ἀπόστ., the προφῆτ., and the διδάσκ. which are expressly adduced in *order of rank*; the ἔπειτα and εἶτα which follow only mark a further succession, and thereafter the enumeration runs off *asyndetically*, which, as frequently also in classical writers (see Krüger, *Xen. Anab.* ii. 4. 28), takes for granted that *completeness* is not aimed at. The two enumerations, here and in vv. 8–10, *supplement* each other; and Rom. xii. 6 ff. also, although the most incomplete, has points peculiar to itself.¹

Vv. 29, 30. None of these functions and gifts is *common property of all* (all gifted persons). This Paul expresses in the animated queries : *But all surely are not apostles?* and so on; whereby, after the same thing had been done positively in ver. 28, the ἐκ μέρους of ver. 27 is now clearly elucidated afresh in a negative way—in order to make the readers duly sensible of the *non omnia possumus omnes*, and of the preposterousness of envy against other gifted persons. — δυνάμεις] *Accusative* depending on ἔχουσιν, not *nominative*, as if it denoted wonder-working *persons* (Bengel, Rückert, de Wette, Oslander, Hofmann, and others); see on ver. 28. — Paul here passes over the ἀντιλήψ. and κυβερν., since it was of no importance to make a complete repetition.—With reference to the whole thought, comp. Homer, *Il.* xiii. 730 f.

Ver. 31. It is not the wish of Paul, by what he has said from ver. 4 up till now regarding the different gifts of the Spirit, to repress the eager striving after them. But the important question is as to the *nature of the gifts* and the *manner of the striving*. Hence : *But be zealous after the better gifts of the Spirit*,² those which are more essential than others, and have a more absolute value for the highest welfare of the church (ver. 7). The δέ is the *autem* marking the transition to a new point. — Ζηλοῦτε, again, does not conflict with ver. 11, because the will of the communicating Spirit is not an arbitrary one, but makes the receptive capacity and the mental tendency of the individual to be the grounds of its own self-determination. The zealous striving after the better gifts consists therefore negatively in this, that one makes such *χάρismata*, as are less generally necessary and have less value for the church (as *e.g.* the *glossolalia*, the reception of which was sought after by many for the sake of show), less the aim towards which he directs his will and cultivates a susceptibility; positively, again, it consists in this, that one makes those better gifts, on the other hand, the object of his ardent desire and the aim of his self-active development, in order to reach in

¹ [No one of these seems to be intended to be exhaustive.—T. W. C.]

² Regarding ζηλοῦν τι, to seek eagerly to

attain something, comp. Dem. 500. 2 (ἀρετήν), 504. 8 (δωρεάς), 1461. 9 (τὰ ἀγαθὰ); Polyb. vi. 25. 11 (τὸ βέλτιον); Wisd. i. 12 (θάνατον).

this way the definite degree of receptivity needful to be the organ of the agency of the πνεῦμα in question, and thereby to become, by the free will of the Spirit, partaker of the better gifts.¹ It is perfectly plain that in this ζηλοῦν *supplicatory prayer* is also included ; but it is arbitrary to limit the conception to it, as does Grotius : “*agite cum Deo precibus, ut accipiatis*” (comp. Heydenreich, Rückert, Hofmann). Equally arbitrary, too, is every departure from the hitherto invariable sense of χάρισμα ; as *e.g.* Morus and Ewald hold faith, hope, and love to be meant ; and Billroth, the fruits arising from love ; Flatt, again (comp. Osiander), even imports the right *use* of the gifts which should be striven after. Comp. on the contrary, as to the difference in value of the charismata, xiv. 2 ff. — καὶ ἔτι κ.τ.λ.] *and furthermore*, yet besides (Luke xiv. 26 ; Heb. xi. 36 ; Acts ii. 26 ; often thus in Greek authors), besides prescribing to you this ζηλοῦτε, *I show you* (now, from chap. xiii. 1 onwards) *a surpassing way*,² an exceedingly excellent fashion, according to which this ζηλοῦν of yours must be constituted. By this he means that the striving after the better gifts must always have *love* as its determining and impelling principle, without which, indeed, the gifts of the Spirit generally would be worthless (xiii. 1 ff.), and the κρείττονα unattainable. Love is thus the most excellent way, which that ζηλοῦν ought to keep. (c²) Rückert (so also Estius) finds here the meaning : “I show you a far better way still, in which ye may walk, namely, the way of love, which far surpasses all possession of charismata ;” and so, too, in substance, Hofmann : “even away beyond the goal of the better charismata I show you a way,” *i.e.* a way which brings you still further than the ζηλοῦν τ. χαρ. τ. κρ. But Paul surely did not conceive of the striving after the better charismata as becoming unnecessary through love, but rather as necessarily to be connected with love (xiv. 1, 39). Besides, he would logically have required to attach his statement not by καί, but by ἐγὼ δέ or ἀλλά ; but even *a priori* it is improbable that he should have merely set down the weighty ζηλοῦτε δὲ τ. χάρισμ. τ. κρείττ. in such a naked way, and should have forthwith forsaken it again with the remark that he would now give instructions *away beyond the better gifts*. Grotius and Billroth connect καθ’ ὑπερβ. with the verb. The former renders : *by way of superfluity* (so also Ewald) ; the latter : “*after a fashion which, as being the best, is certain of its success.*” But the meaning, *by way of superfluity* (ἐκ περιουσίας, ἐκ τοῦ περισσοῦ), corresponds neither to the N. T. use of the phrase (Rom. vii. 13 ; 2 Cor. i. 8, iv. 17 ; Gal. i. 13 ; comp. 4 Macc. iii. 18), nor to its use elsewhere in Greek (Soph. *Oed. Tyr.* 1196 ; Polyb. iii. 92. 10, ix. 22. 8 ; Lucian, *p. merc. cond.* 13 ; Dem. 1411. 14). Moreover, Paul could hardly have considered the following instructions, especially in view of the circumstances of the Corin-

¹ Theophylact aptly says (comp. Chrysostom) : ἡνίξατο ἡρέμα, ὅτι αὐτοὶ αἰτιοί εἰσι τοῦ τὰ ἐλάττονα λαβεῖν· διὰ γὰρ τοῦ εἰπεῖν· ζηλοῦτε, τὴν παρ’ ἐκείνων σπουδὴν ἀπαιτεῖ καὶ τὴν πλειὴ ἐπιθυμίαν περὶ τὰ πνευματικά. Καὶ οὐκ εἶπε· τὰ μείζονα, ἀλλὰ τὰ κρείττονα, τουτέστι τὰ ὠφελιμώτερα. Comp. Bengel : “Spiritus dat ut vult, sed fideles tamen libere aliud prae alio

possunt sequi et exercere. Deus operatur suaviter, non cogit.” So also de Wette.

² Paul has not put the article to ὁδόν, “*suspensos nonnihil tenens Corinthios*,” as Bengel says, who also observes with fine discernment upon the present δείκνυμι, “*jam ardet Paulus et fertur in amorem.*”

thians, as given "further by way of superfluity." It militates against Billroth, again, that the apostle's thought could not be to recommend the *manner of his instruction* regarding the way, but only the *way itself*, as excellent. On the other hand, to take the καθ' ὑπερβ. ὁδόν together is grammatically correct, since it is a genuine Greek usage to attach adverbs of degree to substantives, and that generally by prefixing them. Bernhardt, p. 338 ; Buttmann, *neut. Gr.* p. 83 f. [E. T. 96] ; comp. on 2 Cor. xi. 23 ; also on 1 Cor. viii. 7, vii. 35 ; Stallbaum, *ad Plat. Phœd.* p. 93 B. We find this connection given in the Vulgate, by Chrysostom and Theophylact (καθ' ὑπερβ. τουτέστιν ὑπερέχουσιν), Luther, Erasmus, Castalio, Calvin, and most interpreters. Bengel suggestively describes the superlative conception, which is attached to ὁδόν by καθ' ὑπερβολήν, "quasi dicat : *viam maxime vialem.*"

NOTES BY AMERICAN EDITOR.

(x¹) *Calling Jesus Lord.* Ver. 3.

Of course any man can utter the words, but what the Apostle means is, that no man can make this confession, truly believing all that it implies, unless he be enlightened by the Holy Ghost. And this is precisely what our Lord said to Peter when he made his noble confession, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." "Blessed art thou Simon Bar-Jonah, for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven (Matt. xvi. 16, 17).

(x¹) *The word of wisdom and the word of knowledge.* Ver. 8.

A simpler view of the subject states the difference thus : The word of *wisdom* is the gift of revealing the truth of the gospel, which belonged only to the Apostles ; but the word of *knowledge* is the gift of understanding and explaining correctly the truth thus received, which belonged to the other teachers.

(z¹) *The gift of tongues.* Ver. 10.

The two chief theories on the meaning of this gift are—one, that it was the power of speaking foreign languages without having learned them ; the other, that it was an ecstatic utterance in a tongue different from all known languages of earth, and requiring to be interpreted to be of service to any hearer. The former view was firmly held by the late Dr. Edward Robinson, who insisted that the glossolaly recorded in the second chapter of Acts, being the foundation passage in the whole matter, should control all the other references to the subject. This view of the case may be found sustained by a masterly array of arguments in Dr. Hodge's notes on the text in his *First Corinthians*. With him agree Principal Brown and others. The latter view seems to be held by Stanley, Kling, Speaker's Commentary, Ellicott's Commentary, Beet, and most of the more recent writers. The reader will find a very clear and comprehensive statement of the whole question in the new edition of Schaff's "*History of the Christian Church*" vol. i. 234-243.

(A²) "*The less honourable parts.*" Ver. 23.

Stanley justly remarks upon the terms "weaker," "less honourable," "uncomely," that they are best left undefined, as the Apostle has left them ; the

words being accumulated and varied designedly, so as to include all parts of the human frame without particularly specifying any.

(B²) *Services of help.* Ver. 28.

This word (*antilepseis*), as used in the LXX., is not (like *diakonia*) help ministered by an inferior to a superior, but by a superior to an inferior (see Ps. lxxxix. 18 ; Eccles. xi. 12, li. 7) ; and thus, while inapplicable to the ministrations of the deacon to the presbyter, would well express the various helps rendered by those who had the gift of interpretation, to the congregation at large, or to those who were vainly struggling to express themselves intelligibly in their strange accents.

(c²) “*The more excellent way.*” Ver. 31.

Hodge insists that the original term here is not in itself comparative, and can get that meaning only from the context. But here no comparison is implied. The idea is not that Paul intends to show them a way that is better than seeking gifts, but a way *par excellence* to obtain those gifts. The sense of the verse is therefore, “seek the better gifts, and *moreover* I show you an excellent way to do it.” So Kling and Alford. Shore, in Ellicott’s Commentary, says, “the more excellent way is not some gift to be desired to the exclusion of the other gifts, but a more excellent way of striving for those gifts. You are not to strive for any one gift because it is more highly esteemed or because it is more apparently useful, or because it is more easily attained. That which will consecrate every struggle for attainment and every gift when attained, is LOVE.”

CHAPTER XIII.

Ver. 3. *ψωμίσω*] Elz. has *ψωμίζω*, which is condemned by almost all the uncials. — *καυθήσωμαι*] A B *Σ*, 17, Codd. in Jerome, Copt. Aeth. Ephr. Hier. have *καυχήσωμαι*.¹ But *ἵνα καυχήσωμαι* (given up again even by Lachm.) is a manifest addition, which was written on the margin to call attention to the loveless motive, and supplanted the similar and *difficult* *ἵνα καυθήσωμαι* (C K, min. vss. Chrys. Theodoret, and Latin writers). — Instead of the *subjunctive*, Tisch. has the future *indicative* *καυθήσωμαι* (D E F G I, min. Mac. Max.), which of course could be easily changed by ignorant copyists into the subjunctive, anomalous though it was. — Ver. 8. *ἐκπίπτει*] Lachm. reads *πίπτει*, following A B C* *Σ**, min. and several Fathers. Rightly; the simple form was defined more precisely by way of gloss. Comp. Rom. ix. 6.— *γνώσις, καταργηθήσεται*] A D** F G *Σ*, 17, 47, Boern. Ambrosiast. have *γνώσεις, καταργηθήσονται*. So Rückert (Lachm. on the margin). The plural crept in after the preceding. — Ver. 10. *τό*] Elz. Scholz read *τότε τό*, against decisive testimony.

CONTENTS.—The want of love makes even the greatest charismatic endowments to be worthless (vv. 1–3); excellencies of love (vv. 4–7); eternity of love in contrast to the transient nature of the charismata (vv. 8–13).—This praise of love—almost a psalm of love it might be called—is as rich in its contents drawn from deep experience as in rhetorical truth, fullness and power, grace and simplicity. “Sunt figurae oratoriae, quae hoc caput illuminant, omnes sua sponte natae in animo heroico, flagrante amore Christi et huic amori divino omnia postponente,” Valckenaer, p. 299. In no other passage (comp. especially, Rom. xiii. 8–10) has Paul spoken so *minutely* and *in such a manner* regarding love. It is interesting to compare the eulogy of *Ἔρως*—so different in conception and substance—in Plato, *Symp.* p. 197 C D E. A Christian eulogy on love, but one far inferior, indeed, to the apostle’s, may be seen in Clement, *Cor.* I. 49. (D²)

Ver. 1. *Ἐάν*] is not equivalent to *εἰ καὶ* with the *optative* (Rückert), but it supposes something, the actual existence of which is left dependent on circumstances: *assuming it to be the case, that I speak*, etc. — *ταῖς γλώσσαις τῶν ἀνθρ. κ. τ. ἁγγ.*] To say that *γλῶσσαι* must mean *languages* here (Rückert, Olshausen, Baur, Rossteuscher), is an arbitrary assertion.² Why may it not

¹ [This reading, adopted by Westcott and Hort, is expressed in the margin of the Revised New Testament. It is a case in which the best mss. differ from almost all the other documents.—T. W. C.]

² Rückert: “If I spoke all languages, not only those of men, but also—which would certainly be a higher gift, higher than your *γλώσσαις λαλεῖν* which you esteem so highly

—those of the angels.” So likewise Flatt. Baur renders strangely: “If I spoke not simply in isolated *expressions* taken from different languages, but in those different *languages themselves*; and not simply in the languages of men, but also in the languages of the angels.” This climactic ascent from *glosses* to the *languages themselves* is surely a pure importation. Rossteuscher, if his

be held to mean *tongues*? The expression is analogous to the well-known Homeric one—only much stronger : εἰ μοι δέκα μὲν γλῶσσαι, δέκα δὲ στόματ' εἶεν, *Il.* ii. 489. Comp. Virgil, *Aen.* vi. 625 ; Theophil. *ad Autol.* ii. 16 : οὐδὲ εἰ μυρία στόματα ἔχοι καὶ μυρίας γλῶσσας. The meaning is : *Supposing that I am a speaker with tongues, from whom all possible kinds of articulate tongues might be heard, not simply those of men, but also—far more wonderful and exalted still—those of the angels.* Paul thus describes the very loftiest of all conceivable cases of *glossolalia*. The tongues of *angels* here spoken of are certainly only an abstract conception, but one in keeping with the poetic character of the passage, as must be admitted also with respect to the old interpretation of angelic *languages*. Beza says well, that Paul is speaking “*ὑπερβολικῶς ex hypothesi, ut plane inepti sint, qui h. l. disputant de angelorum linguis.*” Comp. Chrysostom : οὐχὶ σῶμα περιτιθεὶς ἀγγέλοις, ἀλλ' ὁ λέγει τοιοῦτόν ἐστι· καὶ οὕτω φθέγγωμαι ὡς ἀγγέλοις νόμος πρὸς ἀλλήλους διαλέγεσθαι. Others, such as Calovius, Bengel, and several more, have thought of the languages used by the angels *in their revelations to men* ; but these surely took place in the form of *human* language. The ἀρρήτα ῥήματα of 2 Cor. xi. have also been brought in, where, however, there is nothing said of angels.—Why the apostle *begins* with the γλῶσσ. λαλ., is correctly divined by Theodoret (comp. Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Theophylact) : πρῶτον ἀπάντων τέθεικε τὴν παρεξέτασιν ποιούμενος τὸ χάρισμα τῶν γλωσσῶν, ἐπειδὴ τοῦτο παρ' αὐτοῖς ἐδόκει μεῖζον εἶναι τῶν ἄλλων. It had become the subject of over-estimation and vanity to the undervaluing of love. —ἀγάπην] *i.e.* love of one's neighbor, which seeks not its own good, but the good of others in a self-forgetting way. Ver. 4 ff.—*A sounding metal and a clanging cymbal, i.e.* like these, a mere dead instrument of a foreign impulse, without any moral worth, γέγονα *have I become* (and am so : perfect), namely, in and with the actual realization of the supposed case. See Buttmann, *neut. Gramm.* p. 172 [E. T. 199]. To interpret χαλκός as a brazen *musical instrument* (Flatt, Olshausen, with many older commentators), which would otherwise be admissible in itself (comp. generally, Dissen, *ad Pind. Ol.* vii. 83), is wrong here, for the simple reason, that one such is expressly named in addition. The text does not warrant our departing from the general *metal* ; on the contrary, it proceeds from the indefinite to the definite (*cymbal*), from the crude to the product of art. Comp. Plato, *Prot.* p. 329 A : ὥσπερ τὰ χαλκεῖα πληγέντα μακρὸν ἤχεϊ, *Crat.* p. 430 A. —κύμβαλον] brazen basins were so called, which were beaten upon, 2 Sam. vi. 5 ; 1 Chron. xiii. 8, *al.* ; Judith xvi. 2 ; 1 Macc. iv. 54 ; Joseph. *Antt.* vii. 12. 4 ; Xenophon, *de re eq.* i. 3 ; Pind. *Fr.* 48 ; Lucian, *Bacch.* 4, *Alex.* 9 ; Herodian. v. 6. 19. —ἀλαλάζον] *screaming*, an epithet no doubt

theory of an “*angel's language*,” which was the Corinthian *glossolalia*, were correct, would require, in conformity with the plural expression, and with his view of the human languages (the latter being the languages of the nations spoken in Acts ii.), to make the passage refer to *many different* languages of the angels, which they sought to speak at Corinth. If γλῶσσαι meant *lan-*

guages at all, Hofmann would be in the right in holding that *no kind* of speaking should be *excluded* here from the wonderful utterances in question, since the angels also doubtless speak among themselves or to God, so that Paul would *go beyond* what actually took place by *including* also the modes of utterance of the angels.

purposely chosen, which is manifestly at variance with the theory of the soft and scarcely audible (Wieseler, 1838), nay, noiseless (Jaeger) nature of the *glossolalia*. The κύμβαλα were ὀξύφθογγα (*Anthol.* vi. 51). Comp. ἀλαλαγμός of cymbals (Ps. cl. 5) and other loud-sounding instruments, Eur. *Cycl.* 65, *Hel.* 1368.

Ver. 2. That Paul adduces only *two* charismata (προφητεία and πίστις) in the protasis, and consequently uses καὶ εἰδῶ . . . γνῶσιν to mark out the degree of προφητεία, is shown plainly by himself in his repeating the καὶ ἐάν. In the case of these gifts also he is supposing the highest conceivable degree. — τὰ μυστήρια πάντα] *the whole of the mysteries, i.e.* what remains hidden from human knowledge without revelation, as, in particular, the divine decrees touching redemption and the future relations of the Messianic kingdom, iv. 1 ; Matt. xiii. 11 ; Rom. xvi. 25, *al.* — γνῶσιν] *profound knowledge* of these mysteries, as xii. 8. The verb connected with it is εἰδῶ, but in such a way that the latter is to be taken here zeugmatically in the sense : *I am at home in* (Homer, *Od.* ii. 121 ; *Il.* xviii. 363, xv. 412). Observe further, that before it was μυστήρια, but here πᾶσαν, which has the emphasis ; translate : “ *the mysteries one and all, and all knowledge.*” To these two departments correspond the λόγος σοφίας and the λόγος γνώσεως in xii. 8. — πᾶσαν τ. πίστιν κ.τ.λ.] *the whole heroism of faith* (not specially the *faith of miracles*, see on xii. 9), *so that I displace mountains.* — The latter phrase in a proverbial sense (to realize the seemingly impossible), as Jesus Himself (Matt. xvii. 20, xxi. 21) had already portrayed the omnipotence of faith. But without love, even in such an instance of the might of faith there would still not be the *fides salvifica*, Matt. vii. 22. — οὐδέν εἰμι] in an *ethical* respect, *without any significance and value.* Comp. 2 Cor. xii. 11 ; Arist. *Eccl.* 144 ; Soph. *Oed. Rex*, 56 ; Xen. *Anab.* vi. 2. 10, *al.* ; Wisd. iii. 17, ix. 6 ; Bornemann, *ad Xen. Cyr.* vi. 2. 8 ; Stallbaum, *ad Plat. Symp.* p. 216 E ; Ellendt, *Lex. Soph.* II. 430.—Notice further, that Paul only *supposes* the cases in vv. 1 and 2 in a general way ; but they must be conceived of as *possible* ; and their possibility arises from the fact that, in the midst of the charismatic phenomena which made their appearance as if by contagion in the church, men might be carried away and rapt into states of exaltation without the presence of the true ground of the new inward life, the new creature, the true καὶνότης ζωῆς and πνεύματος (Rom. vi. 4, vii. 6).

Ver. 3. “And supposing that I do outwardly the very highest works of love, but without really having love as my inward motive, then I have no advantage therefrom, namely, towards attaining the Messianic salvation” (1 John iii. 14). Comp. Matt. xvi. 26 ; Gal. v. 2. — ψωμίζειν τινά τι means properly : to feed any one with something in the way of putting it by morsels into his mouth ; then generally, *cibare aliquem aliqua re*, Rom. xii. 20. See the LXX. in Schleusner, V. p. 569 ; Valckenaer, p. 303. Only the thing is mentioned here in connection with the verb, but who the persons (*the poor*) are, is self-evident, as also the meaning : *cibando consumsero.* Comp. Poll. vi. 33. — καὶ ἐάν παραδῶ κ.τ.λ.] a yet higher eternal work of love, surrender of the body (Dan. iii. 28), *self-sacrifice.* — ἵνα καυθήσομαι] (see the critical remarks) *in order to be burned.* The reading καυθήσωμαι would be a *future*

subjunctive, a barbarism, the introduction of which in pre-New Testament Greek is due only to copyists. See Lobeck, *ad Phryn.* p. 720 f.; Buttmann, *neut. Gramm.* p. 31 [E. T. 35]. The *sense* should not be defined more precisely than : *in order to die the death by fire*. To refer it, with most interpreters since Chrysostom, to the fiery death of the *Christian* martyrs, is without support from the known history of *that* period, and without a hint of it in the text. Probably such martyr-scenes as Dan. iii. 19 ff., 2 Macc. vii., hovered before the apostle's mind. Comp. Fritzsche, *de conform. Lachm.* p. 20.

Ver. 4. Love is personified ; the living concrete *portrait of her character*, in which power to edify (viii. 1) reflects itself, is presented as if in sharply drawn outline, with nothing but short, definite, isolated traits, positively, negatively, and then positively again, according to her inexhaustible nature. — *μακροθυμεῖ*] *she is long-suffering* ; in face of provocations controlling her anger, repressing it, giving it up, and maintaining her own proper character. The general frame of mind for this is *χρηστεύεται* : *she is gracious* (comp. Tittmann, *Synon.* p. 140 ff.), Clem. Cor. i. 14. The verb is found, besides, only in the Fathers. — Observe here and in what follows the *asyndetic* enumeration, and in this “*incitatio orationis cursus ardorem et affectum*” (Dissen, *ad Pind. Exc.* II. p. 275). But to write, with Hofmann, following Lachmann, *ἡ ἀγάπη μακροθυμεῖ. Χρηστεύεται ἡ ἀγάπη*, is less suitable, for this reason, that, according to the traditional division, the long list of negative predicates which follows is very appropriately headed again by the subject. — *οὐ ζηλοῖ*] negation of all passionate, selfish feelings towards others (envy, jealousy, and such like). — *οὐ περπερεύεται*] *she boasts not*, practises no vaunting. See Cicero, *ad Att.* i. 14 ; Antonin. v. 5, and Gatak. *in loc.* ; also Winer, *Beitr. zur Verbess. d. neutest. Lexicogr.* p. 5 ff. Comp. *πέρπερος* in Polyb. xxxii. 6. 5, xl. 6. 2 ; Arrian. *Epict.* iii. 2. 14.

Ver. 5. *Οὐκ ἀσχημονεῖ*] *she acts not in an unseemly way*. See on vii. 36. To hold that Paul was thereby alluding to unsuitable attire in the assemblies (Flatt), involves an inappropriate petty limitation, as does also the reference to unseemly conduct on the part of those speaking with tongues (de Wette). He means generally everything that offends against moral seemliness. — *τὰ ἑαυτῆς*] comp. x. 33. — *οὐ παροξύνεται*] *does not become embittered*, does not get into a rage, as selfishness does when offended. This is the continuance of the *μακροθυμία*. — *οὐ λογίζεται τὸ κακόν*] *she does not bring the evil*, which is done to her, *into reckoning* (2 Cor. v. 19 ; Rom. iv. 6, *al.* ; Eccus. xxix. 6 ; Dem. 658. 20, 572. 1, *al.*) Comp. 1 Pet. iv. 8. Theodoret puts it happily : *συγγινώσκει τοῖς ἐπταισμένοις, οὐκ ἐπὶ κακῷ σκοπῷ τὰυτα γεγενῆσθαι λαμβάνων*. Others render : *she thinks not evil* (Ewald ; Vulgate : “*non cogitat malum*”). This thought, as being too general in itself, has been more precisely defined, either as : “*she seeks not after mischief*” (Luther, Flatt, and several others ; comp. Jer. xxvi. 3 ; Nah. i. 9), which, however, serves so little to describe the character of love, that it may, on the contrary, be said to be a thing self-evident ; or as : “*she suspects nothing evil*” (Chrysostom, Melancthon, Grotius, Heydenreich, and others ; comp. also Neander), which special conception, again, would be much too vaguely expressed by *λογίζεται*.

Ver. 6. Ἐπὶ τῇ ἀδικίᾳ] *over immorality* (Rom. i. 18, ii. 8), when she sees this in others. In view of the contrast, Chrysostom and others, including Hofmann, take this in too narrow a sense : οὐκ ἐφίδεται τοῖς κακῶς πάσχουσιν, understanding it thus of *delight in mischief*; comp. Luther : “sie lachet nicht in die Faust, wenn dem Frommen Gewalt und Unrecht geschieht” (She does not laugh in her sleeve when the pious suffer violence and wrong). Theodoret puts it rightly, μισεῖ τὰ παράνομα. It is just the *generality* of this thought which specially fits it to form the *copestone* of all those negative declarations ; for in it with its significant contrast they are all summed up. — συγχαίρει δὲ τῇ ἀλήθῃ.] The ἀλήθεια is personified, and denotes *the truth* κατ' ἐξοχὴν, the divine truth contained in the gospel, Col. i. 5 ; Eph. i. 13 ; Gal. v. 7 ; 2 Thess. ii. 12, 13 ; John i. 17, *al.* Love *rejoices with* the truth, has with it one common joy, and this is the most complete contrast to the χαίρειν ἐπὶ τῇ ἀδικίᾳ ; for to make morality prevail, is the ethical aim of the ἀλήθεια (2 Thess. ii. 12 ; Rom. ii. 8), whose joy it is, therefore, when she is obeyed in disposition, speech, and action (1 Pet. i. 22, ὑπακοὴ τῆς ἀληθείας) ; and her companion in this joy is love. Usually ἀλήθεια has been understood of *moral truth, i.e. morality*, as in v. 8 ; either, with Theodoret, Flatt, and most interpreters : *she rejoices over what is good*,—a rendering, however, from which we are debarred by the compound συγχ. ; or, with Chrysostom : *συνήδεται τοῖς εὐδοκίμοις*, Billroth : “she rejoices with those who hold to the right,” Rückert : “she rejoices with the man, who is saved to morality,” Osiander : “she rejoices with the heart, which is filled with the truth and with obedience towards it.” Thereby there is made an arbitrary change in the conception, according to which, in conformity with the antithesis, the δικαιοσύνη (the opposite of the ἀδικία) is not the subject, in fellowship with which love rejoices, but the object of this common joy ; the subject with which love rejoices is that truth. According to Hofmann, the meaning of the passage is, that love has her joy withal, *when the truth comes to its rights in that which befalls any one*. But so also there is no sufficient justice done to the compound συγχ., and the more precise definition, “*in that which befalls any one*,” is imported.

Ver. 7. Πάντα] popular hyperbole. Grotius aptly says : “Fert, quae ferri ullo modo possunt.” — στέγει] as in ix. 12 : all things *she bears*, holds out under them (*suffert*, Vulgate), without ceasing to love,—all burdens, privation, trouble, hardship, toil occasioned to her by others. Other interpreters (Hammond, Estius, Mosheim, Bengel, *al.* ; Rückert hesitatingly) understand : *she covers all up*, i.e. excuses all wrong. Equally correct from a linguistic point of view, according to classical usage ; but why depart from ix. 12 ? — πάντα πιστ.] Opposite of a *distrustful* spirit ; *bona fides* towards one's neighbour in all points. — πάντα ἐλπίζει] opposite of *that* temperament, which expects no more good at all from one's neighbour *for the future* ; good confidence as to the *future* attainment of her ends. — πάντα ὑπομένει] *all things she stands out against*—all sufferings, persecutions, provocations, etc., inflicted on her. This is the established conception of ὑπομονή in the N. T. (Matt. x. 22, *al.* ; Rom. xii. 12 ; 2 Cor. i. 6, *al.*), according to which the *endurance* is conceived of as a *holding of one's ground*, the opposite of

φεύγειν (Plato, *Tim.* p. 49 E, *Theaet.* p. 177 B). Comp. 2 Tim. ii. 10. — Note further how the expressions *rise* as they follow each other in this verse, which is beautiful in its simplicity : if love encounter from others what may seem *too hard* to be endured, *all things she bears* ; if she meet what may cause *distrust*, *all things she trusts* ; if she meet what may destroy *hope* in one's neighbour, *all things she hopes* ; if she encounter what may lead to *giving way*, *against all she holds out*.

Ver. 8. Up to this point the *characteristics* of love have been given ; now on to ver. 13 her *imperishableness* is described, in contrast to the purely temporary destination of the gifts of the Spirit. — οὐδέποτε πίπτει] (see the critical remarks) *never does she fall*, i.e. *she never falls into decay*, remains always steadfast (μένει, ver. 13). The opposite is : καταργηθήσονται, πάνσονται. Comp. Luke xvi. 17 ; Plato, *Phil.* p. 22 E ; Soph. *Ant.* 474 ; Polyb. x. 33. 4, i. 35. 5 ; Dem. 210. 15. The *Recepta* ἐκπίπτει (Rom. ix. 6) is to be taken in precisely the same way. Theodoret puts it well : οὐ διασφάλλεται, ἀλλ' ἄει μένει βεβαία κ. ἀκίνητος, ἐς αἰὲ διαμένονσα· τοῦτο γὰρ διὰ τῶν ἐπαγομένων ἐδίδαξεν. — In what follows εἴτε opens out in detail the general conception of χαρίσματα. *Be it again* (different kinds of) *prophesyings*, *they shall be done away* ; *be it* (speaking) *tongues*, *they shall cease*, etc. This mode of division and interpunctuation is demanded by δέ (against Luther and others, including Heydenreich). Prophecy, speaking with tongues, and deep knowledge, are only appointed for the good of the church for the time *until* the Parousia ; afterwards these temporary phenomena fall away. Even the *gnosis* will do so ; for then comes in the perfect knowledge (ver. 12), and that as the common heritage of all, whereby the deep knowledge of gifted individuals, which is still but imperfect, as it occurs *before* the Parousia, will necessarily cease to subsist.

Vv. 9, 10. Proof of the last and of the first of the three preceding points. The second stood in need of no proof at all. *For in part* (ἐκ μέρους ; its opposite is ἐκ τοῦ παντός, Lucian, *Dem. enc.* 21) *we know*, imperfect is our deep knowledge, *and in part we speak prophetically*, what we prophetically declare is imperfect. Both contain only fragments of the great whole which remains hidden from us as such *before* the Parousia. — ὅταν δὲ ἔλθῃ κ.τ.λ.] *but when that which is perfect shall have appeared* (at the Parousia ; otherwise, Eph. iv. 13), *then will that which is in part* (the *gnosis* and the prophecy therefore also, seeing they belong to the category of the partial) *be done away*. The appearance of the perfected condition of things necessarily brings with it the abolition of what is only partial. With the advent of the absolute the imperfect finite ceases to exist, as the dawn ceases after the rising of the sun. We are not to supply, with Hofmann, γινώσκειν and προφητεύειν (as substantival infinitives) to τὸ τέλειον and to τὸ ἐκ μέρους, by which unprecedented harshness of construction the sense would be extorted, that only the *imperfect* γινώσκειν and προφητεύειν will cease to make room for the perfect. But what Paul means and says is that these charismata generally, as being designed only for the aeon of the partial, and not in correspondence with the future aeon of the perfect, will cease to exist at the Parousia ; their design, which is merely temporary, is then

fulfilled. With the advent of the Parousia the other charismata too (xii. 8 ff.) surely cease altogether : not simply that the imperfection of the way in which they are exercised ceases.

Ver. 11. Illustration of what was said in ver. 10 by an analogy taken from each man's own personal experience in life, inasmuch, namely, as our present condition, when compared with our condition in the αἰὼν μέλλον, is like that of the child in comparison with that of the man. The man has *given up* the practices of the child. (E²) —ἐφρόνουν refers to the interest and efforts (device and endeavour), ἐλογ. to the judgment (reflective intellectual activity). To make ἐλαλ., however, point back to the glossolalia, ἐφρ. to the prophesying, and ἐλογ. to the *gnosis* (Oecumenius, Theophylact, Bengel, Valckenaer, Heydenreich, Olshausen, D. Schulz, Ewald ; Osiander undecided), is all the less warranted an assumption, seeing that ἐφρ. and ἐλογ. are no specific correlates of the prophecy and *gnosis* respectively.

Ver. 12. Justification of this analogy in so far as it served to illustrate the thought of ver. 10. — ἄρτι] *i.e.* before the Parousia. — δι' ἐσόπτρον] *through a mirror* ; popular mode of expression according to the optical appearance, inasmuch, namely, as what is seen in the mirror appears to stand *behind* it. The meaning is : *our knowledge of divine things is, in our present condition, no immediate knowledge, but one coming through an imperfect medium.* We must think not only of our glass mirrors, but of the imperfectly reflecting metal mirrors¹ of the ancients (Hermann, *Privatalterth.* § 20. 26). Τὸ ἔσοπτρον περίστησι τὸ ὁρώμενον ὀπίσθιόν τε, Chrysostom: This is enough of itself to enable us to dispense with the far-fetched expedient (Bos, Schoettgen, Wolf, Mosheim, Schulz, Rosenmüller, Stolz, Flatt, Heydenreich, Rückert, and others) that ἔσοπτρον means *speculare*, a window made of talc (*lapis specularis*, see Pliny, *Nat. Hist.* xxxvi. 22). In support of this, such Rabbinical passages are adduced as *Jevamm.* iv. 13, “Omnes prophetae viderunt per specular (כַּאִי־סִפְקָלְרִיא) obscurum, et Moses, doctor noster, vidit per specular lucidum.” See Buxtorf, *Lex. Talm.* p. 171 ; Wetstein *in loc.* But against this whole explanation is the decisive fact that the assumed meaning for ἔσοπτρον is quite undemonstrable, and that no expositor has succeeded in establishing it. It always means *mirror*, as do also ἐνοπτρον and κάτοπτρον (Pindar, *Nem.* vii. 20 ; Anacreon, xi. 2 ; Plutarch, *Praec. conjug.* 11 ; Luc. *Amor.* 44, 48 ; Wisd. vii. 26 ; Ecclus. xii. 11 ; Jas. i. 23) ; a talc window is διόπτρα (Strabo, xii. 2, p. 540). — ἐν αἰνίγματι] which should not be separated from δι' ἐσόπτρον by a comma, is usually taken adverbially (Bernhardy, p. 211), like αἰνιγματικῶς, so that the object of vision shows itself to the eye in an *enigmatic way*. Comp. also Hofmann, who holds that what is meant is an expression of anything conveyed in writing or symbol, of such a kind that it offers itself to our apprehension and eludes it in quite equal measure. But αἰνίγμα is a dark *saying* ; and the idea of the *saying* should as little be lost here as in Num. xii. 8. This, too, in opposition to de Wette (comp. Osiander), who takes it as the *dark reflection in the mirror*, which one sees, so that ἐν stands for εἰς in the sense of the *sphere* of sight. Rückert takes

¹ Hence the designation χαλκὸς διαυγής for a mirror. See Jacobs, *ad Anthol.* VI. p. 378.

ἐν for εἰς on an exceedingly artificial ground, because the seeing here is a *reading*, and one cannot read εἰς τὸν λόγον, but only ἐν τῷ λόγῳ. Luther renders rightly : *in a dark word* ; which, however, should be explained more precisely as *by means of an enigmatic word*, whereby is meant the word of the gospel-revelation, which capacitates for the βλέπειν in question, however imperfect it be, and is its medium to us. It is αἰνιγμα, inasmuch as it affords to us, (although certainty, yet) no full clearness of light upon God's decrees, ways of salvation, etc., but keeps its contents sometimes in a greater, sometimes in a less degree (Rom. xi. 33 f. ; 1 Cor. ii. 9 ff.) concealed, bound up in images, similitudes, types, and the like forms of human limitation and human speech, and consequently is for us of a mysterious and *enigmatic nature*,¹ standing in need of the future λύσις, and vouchsafing πίστις, indeed, but not εἶδος (2 Cor. v. 7) ; comp. Num. xii. 8. To take ἐν in the *instrumental* sense is simpler, and more in keeping with the conception of the βλέπειν (*videre ope aenigmati*) than my former explanation of it as having a *local* force, as in Matt. vi. 4 ; Eccclus. xxxix. 3 (*in aenigmate versantes*). — τότε δέ] ὅταν δὲ ἐλθῇ τὸ τέλειον, ver. 10. — πρόσωπον πρὸς πρόσωπον] according to the Hebrew פָּנִים אֶל-פָּנִים (Gen. xxxii. 30 ; comp. Num. xii. 8), *face to* (coram) *face*, denotes the *immediate vision*. Grammatically πρόσωπον is to be taken as nominative, in apposition,² namely, to the *subject* of βλέπομεν, so that πρὸς πρόσωπον applies to the *object* seen. And it is *God* who is conceived of as being this object, as is evident from the parallel καθὼς καὶ ἐπεγνώσθην : — ἄρτι γινώσκω κ.τ.λ.] consequence of the foregoing spoken *asyndetically*, and again in the first person with individualizing force, in the victorious certainty of the consummation at hand. — ἐπιγνώσομαι καθὼς καὶ ἐπεγνώσθ.] cannot mean : *then shall I know as also I am known*, i.e. *as God knows me* (so most interpreters), but (observe the *aorist*) : *as also I was known*, which points back to the era of conversion to Christ (for the apostle himself, how great a remembrance !), when the Christian became the object of the divine knowledge (see on viii. 3) turning to deal with him effectually. The meaning therefore is : “*but then will my knowledge of God be so wholly different from a merely partial one, as it is now, that, on the contrary, it will correspond to the divine knowledge, so far as it once at my conversion made me its object*, namely (opposite of ἐκ μέρους) *by complete knowledge of the divine nature, counsel, will, etc., which present themselves to me now only in part.*” Notice further that the stronger term ἐπιγνώσομαι is selected in correspondence with the relation to the preceding simple γινώσκω (Bengel, *pernoscam* ; see Valckenaer, *ad Luc.* p. 14 f.), and that καί is the ordinary *also* of equivalence. It may be added, that this likeness of the future knowledge to the divine is, of course, *relative* ; the knowledge is “*in suo genere completa, quanta quidem in creaturam rationalem cadere potest,*” Calovius.

¹ The objection, that Paul would hardly have called the revelation αἰνιγμα (see de Wette) is sufficiently set aside by the consideration that he calls it so *relatively*, in relation to the unveiling *still to come*. Melancthon puts it happily. “*Verbum enim*

est velut involucrum illius arcanæ et mirandæ rei, quam in vita coelesti coram aspiciemus.”

² As *appositio partitiva*. See Matthiae, § 431. 3. Fritzsche, *ad Matth.* iii. 12. Krüger, § 57. 10.

Ver. 13. *Nυνὶ δέ*] *nunc autem, and thus*, since, according to ver. 8 to 12, the present temporary charismata do not continue, but cease in the future age, *continue* (into the everlasting life and onward in it) *faith, hope, love*.¹ This explanation of *νυνὶ δέ* in a conclusive sense, as xii. 18, 20, and of *μένει* as meaning eternal continuance,² has been rightly given by Irenaeus, *Haer.* ii. p. 47, iv. 25 ; Tertullian, *de pat.* 12 ; Photius in Occumenius, p. 553 ; Grotius, Billroth, de Wette, Osiander, Lipsius (*Rechtfertigungsl.* pp. 98, 210), Ewald, Maier, Hofmann. For, although the majority of interpreters since Chrysostom (including Flatt, Heydenreich, Rückert, David Schulz, Neander) have explained *νυνὶ δέ* in a *temporal* sense : “but for the present, so long as that glorious state lies still far off from us” (Rückert), and *μένει* of continuance in the present age (in the church), this is incorrect for the simple reason, that Paul, according to ver. 8 ff., expected the charismata to cease only at the Parousia, and consequently could not have described merely the triad of faith, hope, and love as what was now remaining ; the *γνώσεις* also, prophecy, etc., remain till the Parousia. Hence, too, it was an erroneous expedient to take *μένει* in the sense of the *sum total*, which remains as the result of a *reckoning* (Calvin, Bengel, and others). — *πίστις*] here in the established sense of the *fides salvifica*. This remains, even in the world to come, the abiding *causa apprehendens* of blessedness ; what keeps the glorified in *continued possession* of salvation is their abiding trust in the atonement which took place through the death of Christ. Not as if their everlasting glory might be lost by them, but it is their assured possession just through the fact, that to them as *συγκληρονομοί* of Christ in the very beholding and sharing His glory the faith, through which they *become* blessed, must remain *incapable of being lost*. The everlasting fellowship with Christ in the future *αἰών* is not conceivable at all without the everlasting continuance of the living *ground* and *bond* of this fellowship, which is none other than *faith*. — *ἐλπὶς*] equally in its established N. T. sense, *hope of the everlasting glory* ; Rom. v. 1, and frequently. This abides for the glorified, *with regard to the everlasting duration and continued development* of their glory. *How* Paul conceived this continued development and that of the Messianic kingdom itself to proceed in detail, cannot indeed be proved. But the idea is not on that account unbiblical, but is necessarily presupposed by the continuance of hope, which is undoubtedly asserted in our text. Moreover, in xv. 24, steps in the development of the future *βασιλεία* are manifestly given, as indeed the everlasting *δόξα* generally, according to its essential character as *ζωή*, is not conceivable at all without development to ever higher perfec-

¹ The three so-called theological virtues. But faith and hope might also be called *virtues*, “quia sunt obedientia, quam postulat Deus praestari suo mandato,” Melancthon.

² If, again, it be assumed that the conception of *μένει* differs in reference to its different subjects, this is nothing but arbitrary importation. Osiander (comp. Theophylact before him) holds that the *μένειν*

has different degrees ; in the case of faith and hope, it lasts on to the Parousia ; in the case of love, it is absolute, onward beyond the Parousia. And as distinguished from the charismata, it denotes in the case of faith and hope the *constant* continuance as opposed to the *sporadic*. What *accumulated* arbitrariness ! Lipsius is correct in substance, but does not define specifically enough the conception of the *πίστις*.

tion for the individual, and therefore also is not conceivable without the continuance of hope. The conception of this continued development is not excluded by the notion of the *τέλειον*, ver. 10, but belongs thereto.¹ Billroth is wrong in saying "faith and hope remain, in so far as *their contents* is eternal." That is to confound the objective and subjective. De Wette (comp. Maier) holds that "faith and hope, which go directly to their object, remain *by passing over into sight*." But in that way precisely they would *not* remain (Rom. viii. 24 ; Heb. xi. 1), and only *love* would remain. For all the three the *μένειν* must be meant in the same sense. Our interpretation, again, does not run counter either to 2 Cor. v. 7 (where surely the future *seeing* of the salvation does not exclude the continuance of the *fides salvifica*), or to Rom. viii. 24, Heb. xi. 1, since in our text also the hope meant is hope of *something future* not yet come to *manifestation*, while the *fides salvifica* has to all eternity a suprasensuous (Heb. *loc. cit.*) object (the atoning power of the sacrifice of Jesus). Hofmann transforms it in his exposition to this, that it is asserted of the *Christian* who has believed, hoped, and loved that he brings thither with him what he *is* as such, so that he has an abiding heritage in these three things. But that is not what Paul says, but simply that even in the future aeon, into which the charismata will not continue, Christians will not cease to believe, to hope, to love. — τὰ τρία ταῦτα] brings the whole attention, before anything further is said, earnestly to bear upon this triad. — μείζων δὲ τούτων] is not to be taken as μείζων δὲ ἢ ταῦτα, for τούτων must apply to the foregoing τὰ τρία ταῦτα, but as : *greater however* (comp. xiv. 5) *among these* i.e. *of higher value* (than the two others) *among these three, is love*. Regarding μείζων with the gen. *partitivus*, comp. Matt. xxiii. 11. Hofmann has no warrant for desiderating the article ; comp. Luke ix. 46. *Why* love holds this highest place, has been already explained, vv. 1–7 ;² because, namely, in relation to *faith* love, through which it works (comp. Gal. v. 6), conditions its moral worth (vv. 1–3) and the moral fruitfulness of the life of Christian fellowship (vv. 4–7) ; consequently without love (which is *divine* life, 1 John iv. 8, 16) faith would be something egotistical, and therefore spurious and only apparent, not even existing at all as regards its true ethical nature ;³ from which it follows at the same time that in relation to *hope* also love must be the greater, because if love fails, the hope of fu-

¹ Comp. also Delitzsch, *Psychol.* p. 473.

² The interpreters who take *νυνὶ δέ* to mean, *but for the present*, follow for the most part Chrysostom in stating it as the higher worth of love, that it alone continues in eternity, while faith and hope, as they assume, cease. According to de Wette, Paul seems darkly to indicate the truth that love is the *root* of faith and hope. But even apart from the fact that this is not a Pauline thought, the reader could not be expected after ver. 7 (where nothing of the kind is even indirectly indicated) to arrive at such a thought. Baur too imports what is not in the text when he says that Paul

calls love the greatest, because it is what it is immediately, in an absolute way, and hence also remains always what it is.

³ *Justification*, however, would be by love, only if *perfect* satisfaction were rendered to its requirements, which is not possible (Rom. xiii. 8). Hence the divine economy of salvation has connected justification with *faith*, the necessary fruit and evidence of which, however, is love. Comp. Melancthon, "Aliud est causa justificationis, aliud est necessarium ut effectus sequens justificationem . . . ut in vivente dicimus necessario motum esse, qui tamen non est vitae causa." See also *Form. Conc.* p. 688 ff.

ture glory—seeing that it can only be cherished by the true faith which works by love—cannot with reason exist at all (comp. Matt. xxvi. 35 ff.).
(F²)

NOTES BY AMERICAN EDITOR.

(D²) *The description of love.*

“The surpassing beauty of this chapter has been felt and expressed wherever it has been read, by persons of the most opposite religious views, and by those who can appreciate only its literary qualities. In the chapters that go before there is eloquence too, but of a very different kind—keen, impassioned, vehement; the next chapter but one also rises to the height of sublimity; but here all is serene. The opening verses are a grand introduction to what follows, sweeping away as worthless the very best things which want the cardinal principle of love. This is then defined by no fewer than fifteen characteristics, eight negative and seven positive. The terse precision and wonderful completeness of these strike every discerning reader; while the periods roll on in rhythmic melody to the end of the chapter, like a strain of richest music dying away, or a golden sunset; and everything is seen out but Love, which is found standing alone as the enduring life of heaven” (Principal Brown). — “The very style shows that it rises far above any immediate or local occasion. On each side of this chapter the tumult of argument and remonstrance still rages; but within it, all is calm; the sentences move in almost rhythmical melody; the imagery unfolds itself in almost dramatic propriety; the language arranges itself with almost rhetorical accuracy” (Dean Stanley).

(E²) *I spake as a child.* Ver. 11.

Upon this verse Hodge well says that the feelings and thoughts of a child are true and just, in so far as they are the natural impression of the objects to which they relate. They are neither irrational nor false, but inadequate. In like manner our views of divine things will hereafter be different from those which we now have. But it does not thence follow that our present views are false. They are just, as far as they go; they are only inadequate. It is no part of the Apostle's object to unsettle our confidence in what God now communicates by His word and Spirit to His children, but simply to prevent our being satisfied with the partial and imperfect.

(F²) *Love is the greatest.* Ver. 13.

The remarks of the author on this verse hardly show his wonted acumen. The most satisfactory treatment of the question why Love is the greatest is found in the following citation from Hodge: “Some say, because it includes, or is the root of faith and hope. It is said that we believe those whom we love, and hope for what we delight in. According to Scripture, however, the reverse is true. Faith is the root of love. It is the believing apprehension of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ, that calls forth love to Him. Others say, the ground of superiority is in their effects. But we are said to be sanctified, to be made the children of God, to overcome the world, to be saved by faith. Christ dwells in our hearts by faith; he that believes hath eternal life,

i.e. faith as including knowledge is eternal life. There are no higher effects than these, so far as we are concerned. Others say that love is superior to faith and hope, because the latter belong to the present state only, and love is to continue for ever. But, according to the true interpretation of the verse, all these graces are declared to abide. The true explanation is to be found in the use which Paul makes of this word *greater*, or the equivalent term *better*. In 12, 13, he exhorts his readers to seek *the better* gifts, *i.e.* the more useful ones. And in xiv. 5 he says, 'Greater is he, that prophesies, than he that speaks with tongues'; *i.e.* he is more useful.

"Throughout that chapter the ground of preference of one gift to others is made to consist in its superior usefulness. This is Paul's standard; and judged by this rule, love is greater than either faith or hope. Faith saves ourselves, but love benefits others."

An English writer remarks that the contrast in this verse is not between love which is imperishable and faith and hope which are perishable, but between ephemeral gifts and enduring graces. It is strange how completely in popular thinking this has been lost sight of, and hence we find such words as these:

"Faith will vanish into sight,
Hope be emptied in delight,
Love in heaven will shine more bright,
Therefore give us love;"

which express almost the opposite of what the Apostle really wrote. The same may be said of the close of one of Charles Wesley's most familiar and admired hymns:

"Where faith is sweetly lost in sight,
And hope in full supreme delight,
And everlasting love."

CHAPTER XIV.

Ver. 7. Τοῖς φθόγγοις] Lachm. reads τοῦ φθόγγου, with B, Clar. Germ. Tol. Ambrosiast. Too weakly attested; and after the preceding φωνήν διδόντα (*giving from itself*) the change of the dative into the genitive (Vulgate, *sonituum*), and of the plural into the singular, was very natural. Neither ought we to read, instead of ζῶ (Elz. Lachm. Tisch.), the more weakly attested διδῶ (recommended by Griesb.), which is a repetition from the preceding διδόντα. — Ver. 10. ἐστίν] Lachm. Rück. Tisch. read εἰσίν, following A B D E F G $\aleph$, min. Clem. Dam. Theophyl. The singular is an emendation, in accordance with the neuter plural. — αὐτῶν should be deleted, with Lachm. Rück. Tisch., according to preponderating testimony. A defining addition. — Ver. 13. Instead of διόπερ read διό, upon decisive evidence. — Ver. 15. δέ] is wanting both times in F G, min. Vulg. It. Sahid. Syr. Damasc. and Latin Fathers; the first time also in K, the second time also in B; hence Lachm. deletes only the second δέ. Probably Paul did not write either at all, and B contains merely the insertion which was first made in the first half of the verse. — Ver. 18. Elz. has μου after Θεῶ, which Reiche defends, in opposition to decisive evidence. Addition from i. 4; Rom. i. 8 *al.* There is preponderating testimony for γλώσση (Lachm. Rück. Tisch.) in place of γλώσσαις, as, indeed, in this chapter generally the authorities vary greatly in respect of the singular and plural designation of this charisma. In this passage the plural was inserted because they ascribed the knowledge of ever so many languages to the apostle. — λαλῶν] B D E F G $\aleph$, 17, 67** Copt. Syr. utr. Vulg. It. Oec. and Latin Fathers have λαλῶ (so Lachm. and Tisch.); of these, however, F G, Copt. Syr. utr. Vulg. It. and Latin Fathers have ὅτι before πάντων. A omits λαλῶν altogether (which Rück. prefers, as also D. Schulz and de Wette). The preponderance of attestation is manifestly in favour of λαλῶ, which is also to be regarded as the original. For the omission (A) is explained by the fact that the words from εὐχαριστῶ to γλώσσαις were viewed (in accordance with vv. 14–16) as belonging to each other. Other transcribers, who rightly saw in πάντων ὑμῶν κ.τ.λ. the ground of the εὐχαριστῶ, sought to help the construction, some of them by ὅτι, some by changing λαλῶ into λαλῶν. The latter was welcome also to those who saw in πάντων . . . λαλῶν, not the ground, but the mode of the εὐχαριστῶ, such as Reiche, *Comm. crit.* p. 271, who accordingly defends the *Recepta*. — Ver. 19. Elz. Tisch. read διὰ τοῦ νοός, running counter, it is true, to A B D E F G $\aleph$, vss. and Fathers, which have τῷ νοῖ (so Lachm. and Rück.), but still to be defended, because τῷ νοῖ has manifestly come in from ver. 15. The very old transcriber's error διὰ τὸν νόμον (without μου), which Marcion followed, tells likewise on the side of the *Recepta*. — Ver. 21. ἐτέροις] Lachm. Rück. read ἐτέρων, following A B $\aleph$, min. Rightly; the dative was written mechanically after ἐτερογλώσσοις and χεῖλεσιν. — Ver. 25. Elz. has καὶ οὕτω before τὰ κρυπτά, in opposition to greatly preponderating evidence. The result seemed to begin at this point, hence the subsequent καὶ οὕτω was taken in here and the οὕτω following was left out (so still Chrysostom). After-

wards this second οὕτω was restored again without deleting the first καὶ οὕτω. — Ver. 32. πνεύματα] D E F G and some min. vss. and Fathers have πνεῦμα. But πνεύματα seemed out of place, seeing that it is the *Holy Spirit* that impels the prophets. — Ver. 34. ὑμῶν, which is defended by Reiche and Tisch., is wanting in A B S, min. vss. and Fathers (deleted by Lachm. and Rück.), but was very liable to be omitted from its being non-essential, and from the generality of the precept, and is to be retained on the ground of its old (as early as Syr.) and sufficient attestation. — ἐπιτέτραπται] ἐπιτρέπεται has greatly preponderant authorities in its favour. Recommended by Griesb., adopted by Lachm. Rück. Tisch. Rightly; the sense of the perfect (*permissum est*) came more readily to the mind of the transcribers, both of itself and because of the prevalent reference to the law. — ὑποτάσσεσθαι] Lachm. Rück. read ὑποτασσέσθωσαν, following A B S, and some min. Copt. Bashm. Marcion, Damasc.; an interpretation. — Ver. 35. γυναῖκι] Elz. Scholz read γυναιξί, in opposition to A B S* min. and several vss. and Fathers. The plural was introduced mechanically after the foregoing. — Ver. 37. εἰσὶν ἐντολαί] Many various readings. Among the best attested (by A B S** Copt. Aeth. Aug.) is ἐστὶν ἐντολή. So Lachm. But D* E* F G, codd. of It. Or. Hil. Ambrosiast. have simply ἐστίν; and this is the original (so Tisch.), to which ἐντολή was added, sometimes before and sometimes after, by way of supplement. The *Recepta* εἰσὶν ἐντολαί (defended by Reiche) arose out of the plural expression ἀ γράφω in the way of a similar gloss. — Ver. 38. ἀγνοεῖτω] ἀγνοεῖται occurs in A* (apparently) D* F G S* Copt. Clar. Germ. Or. So Lachm. and Rück.; Rinck also defends it. Other vss. and Fathers have *ignorabitur*. But in the *scriptio continua* an Ω might easily be left out from ἀγνοειτΩΩστε, and then it would be all the more natural to supplement wrongly the defective ἀγνοειτ by making it ἀγνοεῖται, as it was well known that Paul is fond of a striking interchange between the active and passive of the same verb (viii. 2, 3, xiii. 12). One can hardly conceive any ground for ἀγνοεῖται being changed into the imperative, especially as the imperative gives a sense which seems not to be in keeping with apostolic strictness and authority. Offence taken at this might be the very occasion of ἀγνοεῖτω being purposely altered into ἀγνοεῖται.

CONTENTS.—(1) Regarding the higher value of prophecy in comparison with the gift of tongues, vv. 1–25. (2) Precepts regarding the application of the gifts of the Spirit in general, and of the two named in particular, vv. 26–33, with an appended remark on the silence of women, vv. 34, 35. (3) Corroboration of the precepts given, vv. 36–38, and reiteration of the main practical points, vv. 39, 40.

Ver. 1. Διώκετε τ. ἀγάπην] *pursue after love*; asyndetic, but following with all the greater emphasis upon the praise of love, chap. xiii.; while the figurative διώκ. (*sectamini*) corresponds to the conception of the way, xii. 31. Comp. Phil. iii. 12. And after Paul has thus established this *normative* principle as to seeking after the better gifts of the Spirit, he can now enter upon *the latter themselves* more in detail. — ζηλοῦτε δὲ κ.τ.λ.] With this he joins on again to xii. 31, yet not so as to make the δὲ *resumptive*,—in which case διώκ. τ. ἀγάπ. would be left standing in an isolated position,—but in such a way that he *sets over against* the latter the ζηλοῦν τὰ πν. as what is to take place *along with* it. “Let the end which you pursue be love; in con-

nection with which, however,—and upon that I will now enter more particularly,—you are not to omit your zealous seeking after the gifts of the Spirit, but to direct it especially to prophecy.” Comp. Chrysostom, Theodoret, and Theophylact. — τὰ πνευματικά] as in xii. 1, *the gifts of the Spirit generally*, not merely the *glossolalia* (Billroth, Ewald, comp. also Rückert), which first comes in at ver. 2, and that with a definite designation. Μᾶλλον δὲ ἵνα προφ., which is not to be read as a subordinate clause (Hofmann), represents and defines more closely the phrase τὰ χαρίσματα τὰ κρείττονα, xii. 31. Μᾶλλον does not simply compare the longing for prophetic gifts with that for the *glossolalia*,—which is only done in the following verses (in opposition to Hofmann),—but is to be explained: *in a higher degree, however, than for the other gifts of the Spirit*, be zealous that ye may speak prophetically.” The ἵνα thus states the design of the ζηλοῦτε, which we must again mentally supply (comp. ver. 5).

Vv. 2, 3 give the ground of the μᾶλλον δὲ ἵνα προφ. by comparing prophecy with the *glossolalia* in particular, which was in such high repute among the Corinthians.—*For he who speaks with the tongue* (see on xii. 10) *speaks not to men* (does not with his discourse stand in the relation of communicating to men), *but to God*, who understands the Holy Spirit's deepest and most fervent movements in prayer (Rom. viii. 26 f.). Comp. ver. 28. — οὐδεὶς γὰρ ἀκούει] *for no one hears it*, has an ear for it. So too Porphy. *de Abst.* iii. 22; Athen. ix. p. 383 A. What is *not understood* is as if it were *not heard*. Comp. Mark iv. 33; Gen. xi. 7, xlii. 43, and see ver. 16: τί λέγεις οὐκ οἶδε.¹ Wieseler, in 1838, took advantage of ἀκούει in support of his theory of the *soft* and *in-audible* character of the speaking with tongues, against which the very expression λαλεῖν, the whole context (see especially ver. 7 f.) and the analogy of the event of Pentecost, as well as Acts x. 46 and xix. 6, are conclusive. See also on xii. 10, xiii. 1. The emphatic οὐκ ἀνθρ. λαλεῖ, ἀλλὰ τ. Θεῷ militates against Fritzsche, *Nov. opusc.* pp. 327, 333, who takes οὐδεὶς γ. ἀκούει in a *hyperbolic* sense (“nam paucissimi intelligunt, cf. Joh. i. 10, 11”). *No one* understands it,—that is the rule, the exceptional case being only, of course, that some one gifted with the χάρισμα of interpretation is present; but *in and of itself* the speaking with tongues is of such a nature that *no one* understands it. Had Paul meant the speaking in *foreign languages*, he could all the less have laid down that rule, since, according to ver. 23, it was a possible case that *all* the members of the church should speak γλώσσαις, and consequently there would always be some present who would have understood the foreign language of an address. — πνεύματι δὲ λαλεῖ μυστ.] δέ—not the German “*sondern*” (Rückert)—is the *however* or *on the other hand* frequent after a negative statement (see Hartung, *Partik.* I. p. 172; Baeumlein, p. 95). We are not to understand πνεύματι of the objective Holy Spirit, ver. 14 being against this, but of the higher spiritual nature of *the man* (different from the ψυχή). This, the seat of his self-consciousness, is filled in the inspired man by the Holy Spirit (Rom. viii. 16), which, according to the different degrees of inspiration, may either leave the reflective activity of

¹ Comp. also Holsten, *z. Ev. d. Paul. u. Petr.* p. 382.

the understanding (*νοῦς*, ver. 14) at work, or suspend it for the time during which this degree of inspiration continues. The latter is what is meant here, and *πνεύματι λαλεῖν* signifies, therefore, to speak through an activity of the higher organ of the inner life, which directly (without the medium of the *νοῦς*) apprehends and contemplates the divine; so that in *πνεύματι* is implied the exclusion of that discursive activity, which could, as in the case of prophecy, present clearly to itself in thought the movements and suggestions of the Holy Spirit, could work these out, connect them with things present, and communicate them to others in an intelligible way. — *μυστήρια*] *secrets*, namely, for the hearers, hence what was *unintelligible*, the sense of which was shut up from the audience. The mysterious character of the speaking with tongues did not consist in the things themselves (for the same subjects might be treated of by other speakers also), but in the mode of expression, which, as not being brought about and determined by the intellectual activity of the *νοῦς*, thereby lacked the condition connecting it with the intellectual activity of the hearer, for which it was only made ready by the interpretation. Comp. Delitzsch, *Psychol.* p. 362. — *οἰκοδ.* κ. *παρακλ.* κ. *παραμ.*] The first is the *genus*, the second and third are *species* of it: ¹ *edification* (Christian perfection generally) *and* (and in particular) *exhortation* (comp. on Phil. ii. 1) and *consolation*. — *παραμυθία*, only here in the N. T., means *address* in general (Heindorf, Stallbaum, *ad Plat. Phaed.* p. 70 B), then *comfort* in particular; Plato, *Ax.* p. 365 A; Aeschin. *Dial. Socr.* ii. 3; Lucian, *Mort. D.* xv. 3; *de Dea Syr.* 22; Ael. *V. H.* xii. 1; *Wisd.* xix. 12. Comp. on *παραμύθιον*, Phil. ii. 1.

Ver. 4. Difference between the relations of the two in respect of the mentioned *οἰκοδομή*. — *ἐαυτόν*] in so far, namely, as he not merely believes that he feels (Wetstein), but really does feel *in himself* the edifying influence of what he utters. This does not presuppose such an understanding of what he utters as *could be communicated* to others, but it does assume an impression on the whole of a devout and elevating, although mystical kind, experienced in his own spirit. — *ἐκκλησ.*] *a church*, without the article, *an assembly*.

Ver. 5. Δέ] *ἐπειδὴ παρ' αὐτοῖς ἐλάλουν γλώσσαις πολλοὶ, ἵνα μὴ δόξη διὰ φθόνον κατασμικρύνειν τὰς γλώσσας, θέλω, φησὶ, πάντας κ.τ.λ.*, Theophylact. Comp. the δέ, xii. 31. — *μᾶλλον δὲ κ.τ.λ.*] *rather, however, I wish that ye should speak prophetically*. Note here the distinction between the *accusative with the infinitive* and *ἵνα* after *θέλω* (see on Luke vi. 31). The former puts the thing absolutely as object; the latter, as the design of the *θέλω* to be fulfilled by the readers (Nägelsbach on the *Iliad*, p. 62, ed. 3); so that it approaches the imperative force (Fritzsche, *ad Matth.* p. 839). — *μείζων*] *preferable, of more worth*, xiii. 13, because more useful for edification, vv. 6, 26. — *ἐκτὸς εἰ μὴ διερχ.*] *the case being excepted, if he interpret* (what has been spoken with tongues). *ἐκτὸς εἰ μὴ* is a mixing up of two modes of expression, so that *μὴ*

¹ Ver. 4, where the *οἰκοδομή* is named *alone*, testifies to this relation of the three words (in opposition to Rückert). Comp. Bengel, who has noted well the edifying

significance of the two latter points: “*παρακλήσις tollit tarditatem, παραμυθία tristitiam.*”

now seems pleonastic. Comp. xv. 2 ; 1 Tim. v. 19. Not a Hebraism (Grotius), but found also in the later Greek writers (Lucian, *Dial. Mer.* 1 ; *Soloec.* 7). See Wetstein ; Lobeck, *ad Phryn.* p. 459. — Regarding εἰ with the subjunctive, see on ix. 11. The *subject* of διερμ. is not a τις to be supplied (Flatt, comp. Ewald), but ὁ λαλῶν γλ. The passage shows (comp. ver. 13) that one and the same person *might* be endowed with glossolalia *and* interpretation. (G²)

Ver. 6. Νυνὶ δέ] *But so, i.e. but in this condition of things*, since, namely, prophecy is greater than the speaking with tongues when left without edifying interpretation, I, if I came to you as a speaker with tongues, would only then be useful to you when I united with it prophetic or doctrinal discourse. Hofmann is wrong in wishing to refer νυνὶ δέ to the main thought of ver. 5 ; in that case the second part of ver. 5 is all the more arbitrarily overlooked, seeing that the εἰ μὴ in ver. 6 is manifestly correlative to the ἐκτὸς εἰ μὴ in ver. 5. Others take it otherwise. But the key to the interpretation which is in accordance with the context and logically correct lies in this, that the two uses of εἰ μὴ are not *co-ordinate* (which was my own former view), so as in that way to give to the principal clause, τί ὑμᾶς ὠφελήσω, two parallel subordinate clauses (comp. on Matt. v. 18) ; but, on the contrary, that εἰ μὴ, corresponding to the ἐκτὸς εἰ μὴ, ver. 5, is *subordinated* to the first εἰ μὴ. Paul might, forsooth, instead of εἰ μὴ . . . διδαχῇ have written simply : εἰ μὴ ὑμῖν διερμηνεύσω. Instead of doing so, however, he *specifies* the two *kinds* of discourse in which he might give *an interpretation of his speech in tongues*, and says : *If I shall have come to you speaking with tongues, what shall I profit you, if I shall not have spoken to you* (for the sake, namely, of expounding my speech in tongues, ver. 5), *either in revelation, etc.* The apostle possessed the gift of glossolalia (ver. 18), but might also be his own διερμηνευτής, and might apply to the διερμηνεύειν the other apostolic charismata which belonged to him for teaching, prophecy, and διδαχή (xiii. 9 ; Acts xiii. 1). — ἡ ἐν ἀποκαλ. κ.τ.λ.] not *four*, but *two* charismatic modes of teaching are here designated — *prophecy* and *didascalía*. For the former, the condition is ἀποκάλυψις ; for the latter, γνῶσις. See Estius *in loc.* The *prophet* spoke in an *extempore* way what was unfolded and furnished to him by revelation of the Spirit ; the *teacher* (if he did not simply deliver a λόγος σοφίας, xii. 8) developed the deep knowledge which he had acquired by investigation, in which he was himself active, but yet was empowered and guided by the Spirit. This twofold division is not at variance with xiii. 2, from which passage, on the contrary, it is plain that there belonged to prophecy γνῶσις *and* ἀποκάλυψις, the latter of which was not included as a condition of the *didascalía* ; so that the characteristic mark of distinction in prophecy is thus the ἀποκάλυψις. Comp. ver. 30. — ἐν denotes the *inward* (ἀποκαλ., γνῶσ.) and *outward* (προφ., διδ.) form in which the λαλεῖν takes place. Comp. Matt. xiii. 3. — Note further the use of the *first person*, in which Paul comes forward *himself* with all the more convincing force in support of what he says.

Ver. 7. The *uselessness* of a discourse *remaining* in this way unintelligible is now shown by the analogy of musical instruments. — ὁμως] is paroxytone,

and means nothing else than *tamen* (Vulgate), but is put first here and in Gal. iii. 15, although logically it ought to come in only before *ἐὰν διαστολὴν κ.τ.λ.* ; hence it is to be explained as if the order was : *τὰ ἄψυχα, καίπερ φων. διδόντα, εἴτε ἀνλός, εἴτε κιθάρα, ὅμως, ἐὰν διαστολὴν τ. φθ. μὴ δῶ, πῶς γνωσθήσεται κ.τ.λ.* It is rightly taken by Chr. F. Fritzsche, *Nov. Opusc.* p. 329. Comp. C. F. A. Fritzsche, *Conject.* I. p. 52 : “*instrumenta vitae expertia, etiamsi sonum edunt, tamen, nisi distincte sonent, qui dignoscas,*” etc. So Winer, also, at last (ed. 6 ; ed. 7, p. 515 [E. T. 693]), and, in like manner, Buttmann, *neut. Gr.* p. 264 [E. T. 308]. To analyze it into *τὰ ἄψυχα, καίπερ ἄψυχα, ὅμως φωνὴν διδόντα κ.τ.λ.* (Winer formerly, comp. Rückert), brings out an antithetic relation which could not be expected from the context. For what is to be expressed is not that the instruments, although lifeless, *nevertheless sound* ; but this, that the lifeless instruments, *although they sound, nevertheless* give out no intelligible melody, unless, etc. As regards the hyperbaton, common with classical writers also, by which *ὅμως*, instead of following the participle, goes before it,¹ see Matthiae, § 566, 3 ; Krüger, § lvi. 13. 3 ; Stallbaum, *ad Plat. Rep.* p. 495 D ; Ast, *Lex. Plat.* II. p. 447 ; Jacobs, *ad Del. epigr.* p. 232. That *ὅμως* stands for *ὁμοίως*, and should be accented (comp. Lobeck, *ad Soph. Aj.* p. 480, ed. 2) *ὁμῶς* (Faber, Alberti, Wetstein, Hoogeveen, and others), is as erroneous (*ὅμως* means : *equally, together*) as Kypke’s assertion that the paroxytone *ὅμως* means *similiter*. — *διδόντα*] *giving forth*, as Pind. *Nem.* v. 93 ; Judith xiv. 9. *Φωνή* is used of the voice of musical instruments in Eccles. i. 16 ; Esdr. v. 64 ; 1 Macc. v. 31, *al.* Comp. Plat. *Tim.* p. 47 C ; *μουσικὴ φωνή*, *Pol.* iii. p. 397 A ; Plut. *Mor.* p. 713 C ; Eur. *Tro.* 127. — *ἐὰν διαστολὴν κ.τ.λ.*] *If they* (the *ἄψυχα φωνὴν διδόντα*) *shall not have given a distinction to the sounds*, if they shall have sounded without bringing out the sounds in definite, distinctive modulation. “*Harmoniam autem ex intervallis sonorum nosse possumus,*” Cic. *Tusc.* i. 18. 41. Comp. Plat. *Phileb.* p. 7 C D, and Stallbaum *in loc.* — *πῶς γνωσθήσ. τὸ αἰλ. κ.τ.λ.*] *how shall that be recognized which is played upon the flute or upon the cithern ? i.e.* how can it then possibly happen that one should recognize a definite piece of music (a melody) from the sounds of the flute or the cithern ? One is none the wiser from them as to *what* is played. The *repetition of the article* is quite correct : *what is played on the flute, or again*, in the other supposed case, *what is played upon the cithern*. Rückert takes it as meaning, *How is it possible to distinguish between flute and cithern ?* Inappropriate, in view of the essentially different character of the two instruments, and seeing that the question in the context (comp. ver. 9) is not as to distinguishing between the instruments, but as to understanding the melody.—It may be observed, further, that the analogy in ver. 7 would be unsuitable, if Paul had been thinking of *foreign languages*, since these would not have lacked the *διαστολή* of the sounds. This holds also in opposition to the view of the matter which makes it an utterance of *glosses*, as likewise in opposition to Wieseler’s conception of a *soft γένος γλωσσῶν*,

¹ Not always *immediately* before, as Hofmann opines that Paul must have written : *τὰ ἄψυχα ὅμως φων. διδόντα.* See Jacobs, *l.c.*;

also Reisig, *Enarr. Oed. Col.* p. xlvi. Comp., too, 4 Macc. xiii. 26.

seeing that in ver. 7 it is not the *strength* of the sound, but its *distinctness* (comp. Wieseler himself in 1860, p. 114), in virtue of which it expresses a melody, which is the point of comparison.

Ver. 8. Confirmation of the negative implied in πῶς γνωσθήσεται κ.τ.λ., by another yet stronger example : *for also in the case of*, etc. The emphasis is upon σάλπιγξ, a *trumpet*, the simple sounds of which are assuredly far more easily intelligible as regards their meaning and design than those of flute and cithern. — ἄδηλον] *not clear*, uncertain, *qui dignosci nequeat*, Beza. “Unius tubae cantus alius ad alia vocat milites,” Bengel. Comp. φωνάς τινὰς ἀσήμενος, Lucian, *Alex.* 13. — φωνήν] comp. *Il.* xviii. 219. — εἰς πόλεμον] *to battle*, Hom. *Il.* i. 177, iv. 891 ; Pind. *Ol.* xii. 5 ; Plato, *Phaed.* p. 66 C ; Eccles. xxxvii. 5, xl. 6 ; 1 Macc. ii. 41. The signal of *attack* was given with the trumpet. See Wetstein and Valckenaer *in loc.* ; Rosenmüller, *Morgenl.* VI. p. 110.

Ver. 9. Inference from ver. 7 f. : *accordingly, if you also*, etc. — διὰ τῆς γλώσσης] *for it was by means of the tongue* that his readers brought forth so much unintelligible matter through their glossolalia. The ὑμεῖς διὰ τῆς γλώσσης speaking unintelligibly correspond to those instruments in vv. 7, 8 ; hence διὰ τ. γλ. is put immediately after ὑμεῖς, and before εἰάν (comp. vi. 4). — εὐσημον λόγον] *an easily distinguishable discourse*, the meaning of which comes plainly out by clear and distinct words and connection. Comp. Soph. *Ant.* 1008 ; Polyb. x. 44. 3 ; Men. *ap.* Athen. xiii. p. 571 E. — ἔσεσθε γὰρ κ.τ.λ.] expressing the unsuitable relation of *state*, hence not the mere future (comp. Kühner, II. p. 40) : *for ye shall be people, who*, etc. — εἰς ἄερα] palpably illustrates the *uselessness* (what does not remain with the hearer). Comp. ix. 26 ; Lucretius, iv. 929 ; Pflugk, *ad Eur. Hec.* 334. Philo : ἀερόμυθεῖν, *to speak to the wind*, and ἀερόμυθος.

Vv. 10, 11. Another example still to induce them to lay aside this way of speaking. — εἰ τύχοι] *if it so happens, if it is really the case*, i.e. *perhaps*, just as the mere absolute τυχόν also is employed (Isocr. *Archid.* 38 ; *De pace*, 60 ; Xen. *Mem.* vi. 1. 20, and Kühner *in loc.*). So in all the passages in Wetstein, Loesner, p. 293 ; Viger. ed. Herm. p. 301, which are usually adduced in support of what is assumed (by Rückert also) to be the meaning here : *for example*. The phrase has never this meaning, and merely its approximate sense can be so expressed,¹ and that always but very unexactly, in several passages (such as xv. 37 ; Lucian, *Amor.* 27). And in the present case this sense does not suit at all, partly because it would be very strange if Paul, after having already adduced flutes, citherns, and trumpets as examples, should now for the first time come out with a “*for example*,” partly and chiefly because εἰ τύχοι is a defining addition, not to the thing itself (γέννη φωνῶν), but to its quantity (to τοσαῦτα). Comp. Lucian, *Icarom.* 6 : καὶ πολλάκις, εἰ τύχοι, μηδὲ ὅποσοι στάδιοι Μεγαρόθεν Ἀθήναζέ εἰσιν, ἀκριβῶς ἐπιστάμενοι. Paul, namely, had conceived to himself under τοσαῦτα a number indefinite, indeed, but *very great* ;² and he now takes away from this conception its

¹ This also in opposition to Hilgenfeld, *Glossol.* p. 24.

² For this reason he could limit even the

indefinite expression by εἰ τύχοι (in opposition to Hilgenfeld).

demonstrative certainty by *εἰ τύχοι* : *in so great multitude, perhaps, there are different languages in the world.* Billroth, too, followed by Olshausen, takes *εἰ τύχοι* in itself rightly, but introduces an element of irony, inasmuch as he quite arbitrarily takes *τοσαῦτα . . . καὶ οὐδέν* for *ὅσα . . . τοσαῦτα*, and, in doing so, makes *εἰ τύχοι* even reach over to the second clause : “as many languages as there are, probably just so many have sense and significance.” — On *εἰ* with the *optative*, expressing the mere conjecture, it may suffice to refer to Hermann, *ad Viger.* p. 902. — *γένη φωνῶν*] *i.e. all sorts of different languages*, each individual unit of which is a separate *γένος φωνῶν*. The opposite is *φωνὴ μία πᾶσι*, Gen. xi. 1. — *οὐδέν*] namely, *γένος φωνῶν*. Bleek renders it, contrary to the context : *no rational being*. Similarly Grotius and others, so that *αὐτῶν* in the *Textus receptus* would apply to *men*. Comp. van Hengel, *Annot.* p. 194 f., who supplies *ἔθνος* with *οὐδέν*. — *ἄφωνον*] *speechless*, *i.e. no language is without the essence of a language* (comp. *βίος ἀβίωτος*, and the like, in Lobeck, *Paralip.* p. 229 f. ; Pflugk, *ad Eur. Hec.* 612 ; Jacobs, *Del. epigr.* i. 33), *i.e. unintelligible*, and that *absolutely*, not merely for him, to whom it is a foreign tongue (ver. 11). — *οὖν*] *therefore*, draws its argument, not from the great *multitude* of the languages (Hofmann), which, in truth, is not at all implied in what is contained in ver. 11, but from *οὐδέν ἄφωνον*. For were the language spoken to me (*τῆς φων.*) *ἄφωνος*, and so unintelligible *in itself*, I could not in that case appear even as a barbarian to the speaker, because, in fact, what he spoke would be understood *by no man*. The barbarian (*βαρβαρόφωνος*, Herod. vii. 20, ix. 43) speaks only a foreign language, not one altogether devoid of meaning for others. — *τὴν δύναμιν τῆς φωνῆς*] the *signification*, the *sense* of the language (which is being spoken). Polyb. xx. 9, 11 ; Lucian, *Nigr.* 1, *al.* Comp. Herod. ii. 30 ; Plat. *Euthyd.* p. 286 C. — *ἐν ἐμοί*] *with me*, *i.e. in my judgment*. See Valckenaer, *ad Eur. Hipp.* 324 ; Pflugk, *ad Eur. Hel.* 996 ; Winer, pp. 362, 204 [E. T. 483, 273].

REMARK.—Paul has chosen *φωνή* to denote *language*, because in the whole section he has only the meaning *tongue* in his mind for *γλῶσσα*. To instruct his readers regarding the speaking with *tongues*, he uses the analogy of speaking *languages*. Hofmann resorts to the suggestion that Paul must have used *φωνή* here, because he would not have expressed what *καὶ οὐδέν ἄφωνον* was designed to convey by *κ. οὐδέν ἄγλωσσον*. That is incorrect ; for *ἄγλωσσον* would have conveyed the very same thing (*speechless*, Poll. ii. 108 ; Soph. *Trach.* 1060 ; Pind. *Nem.* viii. 41) with the very same point (*et nullum elingue*), if he had used *γλῶσσά* instead of *φωνή*.

Ver. 12. *Inference*, which the readers have to draw from ver. 10 f. “*Therefore* (itaque), seeing, namely, that the unintelligible speaking is, according to ver. 10 f., something so absurd, *seek ye also, since ye are indeed zealous after spirits, with a view to the edification of the church therein, that ye may have abundance.*” The *οὕτω κ. ὑμεῖς*, which is repeated here, must be related to ver. 10 f., just as the *οὕτω κ. ὑμεῖς* in ver. 9 is to ver. 7 f., and may not therefore be made to refer to all that precedes it back as far as ver. 6 (Hofmann). As the former *οὕτω κ. ὑμεῖς* set forth an inference for *warning*, so the present one infers the requisite *precept*, and for both what in

each case immediately precedes serves as the premiss. — Πρὸς τ. οἰκοδ. τ. ἐκκλησ. has the emphasis (in opposition to Hofmann). The absurdity referred to is meant to point the readers, with their zealous striving after gifts of the Spirit, to the right way, namely, that *with a view to the edification of the church*¹ they should seek after ever richer endowments. Consequently it is just as superfluous to isolate οὕτω κ. ὑμεῖς as a sentence by itself (τινὲς in Theophylact, Mosheim, Flatt, Heydenreich), which, moreover, would be quite unsuitable in respect of sense, as it is to assume a suppressed inference after ver. 11 (Estius, Rückert). — Καὶ ὑμεῖς] *you too*; for the Corinthians were in fact to form no *exception* from this general maxim, as in their striving after higher charismata, and especially after the gift of speaking with tongues, seemed, alas, to be the case! — ἐπεὶ ζηλωταὶ ἐστε πνευμ.] on which account you have all the more need of the right regulative! A *pointed hint* for the readers, the force of which they could doubtless feel for themselves. — πνευμάτων] the genitive of the object, to which the zealous striving relates. The *plural* expression is *purposely chosen* κατὰ τὸ φαινόμενον (comp. Hofmann) in keeping with the emulous doings at Corinth. For the specifically different manifestations, in which the manifold working of the One Spirit displayed itself, assumed indeed, in presence of such jealous seeking and striving, such an appearance to the eyes of the observer of this unseemly state of things, as though not one Spirit, but a *plurality of spirits*, differing in kind and importance, were the object of the rivalry. What were διαιρέσεις χαρισμάτων, and hence only different φανερώσεις τοῦ πνεύματος, presented themselves, as matters stood at Corinth, to the eye and pen of the apostle as διαιρέσεις πνευμάτων. Πνευμάτων, therefore, is just as far from standing for πνευματικῶν (Beza, Piscator, Storr, Flatt, and others) as it is from denoting the glossolalia (Heydenrich, Billroth).² To suppose a *real plurality* of spirits, after the analogy of the persons possessed by a number of *evil* spirits (see Hilgenfeld, p. 52 f.), so that a number of *divine* spirits would be meant, is at variance with the N. T. generally, and at variance with xii. 4, 7 ff. — ἵνα περισσ.] Οὐκ εἶπεν· ἵνα κτήσῃσθε τὰ χαρίσματα, ἀλλ' ἵνα περισσεύητε, τουτέστιν ἵνα καὶ μετὰ δαψιλείας πολλῆς αὐτὰ ἔχητε· τοσαῦτον γὰρ ἀπέχω τοῦ μὴ βούλεσθαι ἔχειν ὑμᾶς αὐτὰ, ὅτι καὶ περισσεύειν ὑμᾶς ἐν αὐτοῖς βούλωμαι, μόνον ἂν εἰς τὸ κοινῇ συμφέρον αὐτὰ μεταχειρίζητε, Chrysostom. — ἵνα] sets before us the *object* of the striving as its *design*, as at ver. 1, iv. 2. — What we are to conceive as the *contents* of the περισσεύειν (to *have to the full*, viii. 8; Phil.

¹ πρὸς τ. οἰκ. τ. ἐκκλ. belongs to ζητεῖτε, not to περισσ. (Grotius and many others), because Paul has not written: ζητεῖτε, πρὸς τ. οἰκ. τ. ἐκκλ. ἵνα περισσ. That would be the correct way of putting it first with the emphasis, if it were meant to belong to περισσ., 2 Cor. ii. 4; Gal. ii. 10; Acts xix. 4. This also in opposition to Hofmann, who takes πρ. τ. οἰκ. τ. ἐκκλ. as only a *subordinate* thought ("which then comes to be profitable for the edification of the church") belonging to περισσ. The edification of the church is in truth just the normative test

for the appreciation and right pursuit of the charismata (vv. 3, 4, 17, 26; Eph. iv. 12, 16). The article before οἰκοδ. does not denote the edification *already otherwise taking place*, but is simply = πρὸς τὸ οἰκοδομεῖσθαι τ. ἐκκλησίαν. Paul might either put it or leave it out (ver. 26; Rom. xv. 2; Eph. iv. 29).

² The endeavour to be a speaker with tongues was rather only a particular mode, in which the πνεύματα ζηλοῦν, this general tendency, came into manifestation especially in Corinth.

i. 9, iv. 12, *al.*) is self-evident, namely, what was previously meant by πνευμάτων, *spiritual gifts*.

Ver. 13. Προσευχέσθω ἵνα διερμ.] is taken by Chrysostom, Theodoret, Theophylact, Castalio, Erasmus, Beza, Calvin, Grotius, Estius, Wetstein, Bengel, and others, including Flatt, Bleek, Rückert, Olshausen, Neander, Hofmann, in the sense of : *let him pray for the gift of interpretation*. But against this ver. 14 is decisive, where the προσεύχεσθαι, linked by γάρ to what precedes, must have the same reference with our προσεύχεσθαι in ver. 13. Bleek's objection, that we find εὐχαριστῶ in ver. 18, standing in a different reference than previously, does not hold good, since vv. 17 and 18 do not stand in direct logical connection (as vv. 12 and 14 do), but, on the contrary, with ver. 18 there begins a section of the discourse distinct from the preceding. Without taking ἵνα, with Luther, Vorstius, Wolf, Rosenmüller (comp. already Photius in Oecumenius), as meaning *so that*, the right translation is : *let him pray in the design, in order to interpret* (afterwards what has been prayed γλώσση). Comp. Billroth, David Schulz, Winer, de Wette, Osiander, Ch. F. Fritzsche, Ewald, Maier. The previous general λαλεῖν is thus represented here by προσεύχεσθαι, *i.e.* more precisely described as what it *was*, as address *in prayer* see vv. 14–17. It is objected that ver. 27 militates against this view (see Rückert); that the person praying γλώσση could not have had that design, because he did not know whether the interpretation would be given to him (Hofmann). But our explanation does not in fact assume that *every* man who spoke with tongues was capable of interpreting ; but, on the contrary, that Paul, in ver. 13, was thinking only of such speakers with tongues as possessed also the gift of interpretation (ver. 5). The apostle still leaves out of view the case in which the speaker was not also interpreter (ver. 28); hence we are not to take it with Ewald : “that *people* may interpret it.” The subject is *the speaker himself* (ver. 14 ff.), as in ver. 5.

Ver. 14. Justification of the precept προσενχ. ἵνα διερμ. — *For if I pray with my tongue, my spirit prays, but my understanding is unfruitful*. It is a thoroughly arbitrary and mistaken procedure to take the genitive relation in τὸ πνεῦμά μου otherwise than in ὁ νοῦς μου, and to explain the former, with Bleek, Billroth, Olshausen, Maier, and Chr. F. Fritzsche, following Chrysostom (τὸ χάρισμα τὸ δοθέν μοι καὶ κινεῖν τὴν γλῶσσαν), of the *Spirit of God*, in so far as He has laid hold of the man and speaks out of him. The Holy Spirit, although in the man, is never called the spirit of the man, and cannot be so called, just because He is *different* from the spirit of the man. See ii. 11 ; Rom. viii. 16, ix. 1. No ; τὸ πνεῦμά μου is *my spirit*, *i.e.* my individual principle of higher life (comp. on ver. 2). If I pray with the tongue, this higher life-power in me, which plunges immediately (*i.e.* without the intervention of the discursive reflective faculty) into the feelings and intuitions of the divine, is called into activity, because it is filled and moved by the Holy Spirit as His receptive organ ; but my understanding, my thinking faculty, *furnishes nothing*, ἀκαπὸς ἐστι.¹ — νοῦς in contrast to πνεῦμα, which is the

¹ Namely, to edify the church by the praying ; see ver. 12. Chrysostom, Theoph-

deeper basis of life, the “*penetrable*” (Bengel) of the *νοῦς*, is the reflective discursive power through which the making oneself intelligible to those without is effected, and without the co-operative action of which the human *πνεῦμα* cannot with such one-sided development of its energy express the contents of its converse with the Divine Spirit in such a way as to be intelligible for others who are not specially gifted for this end. Comp. Krumm, *de notionib. psychol. Paul.* p. 64 ff.; Delitzsch, *Psychol.* p. 184; Ernesti, *Urspr. d. Sünde*, II. p. 87 f. Note how definitely Paul here distinguishes the specific activities of the mind, and excludes the *νοῦς* from the glossolalia. And he speaks thus from experience. But were we to think of *foreign languages*, that distinction and exclusion would not be appropriate, or would resolve themselves into a mere self-deception.

Ver. 15. *τί οὖν ἐστὶ;*] *what then takes place?* How then does the matter stand? namely, in consistency with the foregoing, *i.e. what follows then?* Comp. ver. 26 and Acts xxi. 22, and the classical and N. T. phrases: *τί οὖν;* *τί γάρ;* by which we are prepared in a vivid way for what is to follow. See generally, Dissen, *ad Dem. de Cor.* p. 346 f. — *προσεύξομαι*] the future denotes what in consistency *will be done* by me. The hortatory *subjunctive* in both clauses (*προσεύξωμαι*, A D E F G) is a bad emendation, which in *κ* is carried out only in the first clause. — *προσεύξ. κ. τῷ νοί*] (*dative of instrument*) is to be understood, in accordance with ver. 14, of the interpretation following, which the person speaking with tongues gives of his tongue-prayer (*προσευχ. τῷ πν.*) in a way suited to the understanding, and by consequence intelligible. — *ψαλῶ*] applies to improvised *psalms*, which in the glossolalia were sung with the spirit, and after an intelligible manner in the way of interpretation. Comp. generally on Eph. v. 19.

Ver. 16. *Ἐπεὶ*] *for*, without this *ψάλλειν καὶ τῷ νοί*, *i.e. otherwise* (xv. 29; Rom. iii. 6, *al.*), the layman, in fact, when thou praisest with the spirit, cannot say the Amen, etc. — *ἐὐλογεῖν* and *ἐὐχαριστεῖν* denote substantially one and the same thing, the *thanksgiving prayer*, the former word referring more to the form of praise to God (*ברכה*), the latter more to its contents. Comp. on x. 16; Matt. xiv. 19. — *ἀναπληροῦν τ. τόπον τινός*, *to fill the place of any one*, is not a Hebraism (*מָלֵא מְקוֹם פְּ*), in the sense of *in statu et conditione alicujus esse* (see Buxtorf, *Lex. Talm.* p. 2001), but corresponds to the Greek expressions: *πληροῦν τὴν χώραν*, *to occupy the place*, *ἀναπληροῦν τὴν ἑδραν* (Plat. *Tim.* p. 79 B), and the like, so that *τόπος* is not to be taken in the abstract sense of *position* (in opposition to de Wette, Hofmann), but applies quite literally to the *place*¹ *in the assembly*. With this is improperly comparēd Josephus, *Bell.* v. 2. 5, where we have not *τόπον*, but *τάξιν*. And he who occupies the place of *the layman* is, according to the connection, *every one in the assembly who is not endowed with glossolalia or its interpretation*. Where he sits is, in this particular relation (be he himself even a prophet or teacher), *the place of the layman*. Paul speaks *vividly*, as if he saw the assembly

ylact, Calvin, Estius, and others erroneously hold it to apply to one's *own* profit. Theodoret rightly remarks: *καρπὸς τοῦ λέγοντος ἢ ὠφέλεια τῶν ἀκουόντων*.

¹ Even in passages like Clem. *ad Cor.* I. 40. 44, *τόπος* is not the abstract “*position*,” but the *post*, the *place* which a man has in the hierarchy or polity of the church.

before his mind's eye. Regarding *ιδιώτης* (comp. 2 Cor. xi. 6), which, like our *layman*, obtains its definition from the context in each case, see on Acts iv. 13. — *πῶς ἐρεῖ*] *how is it* (reasonably) *possible that he shall say*.—The custom, arising out of the time-hallowed usage in connection with oaths, imprecations, vows, prayers, etc. (Num. v. 22 ; Deut. xxvii. 15 ff. ; Neh. viii. 6, *al.*), that the audience at the close of a public prayer should express their assent, and their faith in its being heard, by *amen*, was introduced among the Christians from the synagogues (Buxt. *Lex. Talm. sub voce* אָמֵן ; Vitranga, *de Synag.* p. 1093 ; Schoettgen, *Hor.* p. 654 ff. ; Wetstein), and has in this passage apostolic confirmation.¹ — *τὸ ἀμήν*] the amen to be pronounced by him. — *ἐπί*] *to thy prayer*, to which the amen is added. Observe the *σῆ* bringing the matter into prominence. (H²)

Ver. 17. *For thou indeed* (by thyself considered) *utterest an excellent thanksgiving-prayer*. This Paul admits, and with reason, since the speaker prayed *ὑπὸ τῆς θείας ἐνεργούμενος χάριτος* (Theodoret). — *ὁ ἕτερος*] *ὁ ἀναπληρῶν τὸν τόπον τοῦ ιδιώτου*, ver. 16. (I²)

Vv. 18, 19. Confirmation by the apostle's own example of what has been said against the public speaking with tongues. — *I thank God, more than you all speak I with the tongue*, in a higher degree than you all I have this charisma. Such direct modes of expression, instead of a connecting *ὅτι*, occur likewise in Greek writers ; see Stallbaum, *ad Gorg.* p. 460 A ; Hartung, *Partikell.* II. p. 134 ; Kühner, § 760 a. Even the *Recepta λαλῶν* would have to be taken as *stating the ground* of the *εὐχαρ.* *τῷ Θεῷ* (comp. xi. 29 ; Acts iv. 21, *al.*), not, with Reiche (whom Hofmann follows in his explanation of this reading, which, however, he rightly rejects), as referring to the *manner* of it (I make more frequently and more fervently than any of you thanksgiving prayers in glossolalia to God). There would thus result a declaration, the *tenor* of which hardly suits the character of the apostle, as indeed such an unconditionally expressed *assertion* could not be *upheld* by him. *Μᾶλλον* can only denote the greater measure of the *endowment* ; see already in Chrysostom. — *ἐν ἐκκλ.*] *in the assembled church*, opposite of private devotion. — *θέλω ἢ*] The *preferential will* (*malle*) is implied in the logical relation of the relative verbal notion to the particle, without there being any need of supplying *μᾶλλον*. See Hartung, II. p. 72 ; Klotz, *ad Devar.* p. 589 f. ; Bacumlein, *Partik.* p. 136.

Ver. 20. Up to this point Paul has been contending against speaking with tongues in public and without interpretation, on the ground of its uselessness. He now adds an animated and winning admonition, well calculated to meet the conceit of the Corinthians on this point. — *ἀδελφοί*] “*suavem vim habet*” (Bengel). — *Become not children as respects your power of judgment*. His readers were becoming so, inasmuch as, through their increasing craving after glossolalia, they lacked more and more the power of distinguishing and judging between the useful and the useless ; their speaking with tongues assumed the character of childishness. *As regards malice* (v.

¹ “Vult Deus consensum esse ecclesiae in doctrina, fide, invocatione et petitione,” etc.—Melancthon.

8), *on the other hand be children*; have a child-nature in quite another respect, namely, by being free from all malicious thoughts and actions (Matt. xviii. 3). Comp. Rom. xvi. 19; Gal. vi. 3; Tit. i. 10; Lucian, *Halc.* 2: *νηπιότης φρενῶν*. — Regarding *νηπιάζειν*, *to be a child* (in Greek writers also *νηπιάχειν* and *νηπιαχέειν*), comp. Hipp. *Ep.* p. 1281. 52. — *τέλειοι*] *of full age, adultus*. See Plat. *Legg.* xi. p. 929 C. Comp. on Eph. iv. 13.

Ver. 21. You go *against Scripture* with your foolish doings! This is the *theological* side of the judgment, which Paul now further brings forward, before he imparts in ver. 26 ff. the final precepts for the right procedure. — *νόμος*] of the O. T. generally. See on Rom. iii. 19; John x. 34. — The passage is Isa. xxviii. 11, 12 in a very free¹ variation from the LXX. — *ὅτι*] *for*, 'ב, belongs, with the rest, to the Scriptural quotation (LXX. : *ὅτι λαλήσουσι τὰ λαῶ τούτῳ*), and has here therefore no reference in the context. — The historical sense of the original text (in which Jehovah threatens to send *foreign-speaking men*, i. e. *barbarians*, upon the kingdom of Judah, etc.) is taken up *typically* by Paul in such a way that he, looking back from the phenomenon of the present upon that prophetic utterance, recognizes in it the Christian glossolalia divinely foreshadowed, as regards its *substance*, namely, in the characteristic *ἐν ἑτερογλώσσοις . . . ἑτέριοις*, and, as regards its *destination*, in *καὶ οὐδ' οὕτως εἰσακ.* — *ἐν ἑτερογλώσσοις κ.τ.λ.*] *in peoples of another tongue* (conceived of as *organs* of the visiting God, who speaks in their persons; hence *ἐν*, comp. 2 Cor. xiii. 3; Heb. i. 2) *and in lips of others* (*ἐτέρων*, see the critical remarks) *will I speak to this nation*. According to the *original text*, the reference is to people *who speak a foreign language* (the Assyrian, comp. xxxiii. 19), and to lips of *foreigners* (other than Israelites); but the similarity of the relation, which presents itself in the type and anti-type, consists in the extraordinary phenomenon of the *strange* divine speaking, which becomes perceptible in the case of the type in the foreign language, in that of the antitype in the character of the glossolalia, so wholly different from ordinary intelligible speech. In virtue of this unintelligibility, the speaking in tongues also was for the hearers a speaking in *strange* tongues, and he who spoke was not one like-tongued, i. e. using the like language (*ὁμόγλωσσος*, Xen. *Cyrop.* i. 1. 5; Herod. i. 17, viii. 144; Lucian, *Scyth.* 3, *de Salt.* 64), but a *strange-speaking* man (*ἑτερόγλωσσος*, Polyb. xxiv. 9, 5; Strabo, viii. p. 333; Aq. Ps. cxiii. 1), and his lips a *stranger's* lips. What is in the original text: *בְּלִשְׁוֹן אֲחֵרֶת*, Paul renders more freely than the LXX. (*διὰ γλώσσης ἑτέρας*), and making it personal, by *ἐν ἑτερογλώσσοις*; ² the

¹ Hence (and on account of the quite general *ἐν τ. νόμῳ*) Ewald derives the words from a source now unknown to us. Still, for a typical reference to the speaking with tongues, Isa. xxviii. 11 f. is characteristic enough. But if Paul had this passage in his eye, he must have understood it of men *speaking foreignly*, not, as Ewald explains the prophetic words, of the language of the *thunder* and of terrible punishment.

² Wieseler in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1838, p. 734 ff., infers from our passage that Paul

recognizes a double formula for the gift of tongues, a shorter one, *γλ. λ.*, and a longer, *ἐτέρ. γλ. λ.* Certainly too wide an inference, since in no other place does the apostle bring forward the characteristic element of *ἐτέρας*. He was using the quotation in order to prove the destination of the glossolalia for unbelievers, but could *not* use *διὰ φανλισμὸν χειλέων*, which besides the LXX. has incorrectly, and therefore altered it in accordance with the parallel in the passage, *διὰ γλ. ἑτέρας*. We may infer consequently

Hebrew בְּלִעְגֵי שִׁפְהָ, again (*through stammerers of the lip*, i.e. through men speaking unintelligibly, because in a strange tongue, he renders more correctly as regards the general sense than the LXX. (who have erroneously διὰ φανλισμὸν χειλέων, *on account of mockery of the lips*, comp. Hos. vii. 16) by ἐν χεῖλ. ἐτέρ., putting it, however, impersonally, and reversing the order of the two clauses. It may be added that it is clear from the parallel χεῖλεσιν that Paul conceived of γλῶσσα in ἑτερογλώσσοις as “*tongue*,” as לִשָּׁה also is conceived of in the original text,—both as instrument of the λαλεῖν. The tongue is ἄγγελος λόγων, Eur. *Suppl.* 205. — τῷ λαῶ τούτῳ] applying in its historical meaning to the disobedient people of Israel, which, however, is a type of those who reject the Christian faith, represents therefore the latter in the view of the apostle. (J²) — Καὶ οὐδ’ οὕτως] *and not even so*, dealt with by such a measure, *will they hearken to me* (obey me, Ecclus. iii. 6, xxxix. 3; and in classical writers). This second half of the passage is, for the demonstration, the main point. See ver. 22.

Ver. 22. Ὡστε] *Accordingly*, namely, in accordance with this οὐδ’ οὕτως εἰσακούσ. μου. — εἰς σημεῖον κ.τ.λ.] The phenomenon of the speaking with tongues is *destined for a* (divine) *sign, not for the believers, but for the unbelievers*, i.e. *to make those to whom the glossolalia goes forth be recognized as unbelievers*. This view alone corresponds to the express οὐδ’ οὕτως εἰσακούσ. μου from which the inference is drawn, as well as to what is further inferred in ver. 23. At variance, on the other hand, with both stands the interpretation which has been the ordinary one since Chrysostom (and which has hitherto been my own), that the speaking with tongues is called a sign for the unbelievers, *because it was intended to arrest and move them so that they should reflect and become believers*. Equally unsuitable is it that Chrysostom, Theophylact, and others, including Hofmann, only half carry out this traditional interpretation, and stop short at the *impression of something astounding and amazing*, whereby the γλῶσσαι are to be a σημεῖον to the unbelievers, which, moreover, in presence of the notion of a divine σημεῖον, could only appear as a means to an ulterior end. We must keep the οὐδ’ οὕτως εἰσακούσ. μου sharply before us in order to determine accurately the notion of the σημεῖον κ.τ.λ. Billroth, moreover (comp. Beza, Vatablus, Calovius, Cornelius à Lapide, and others), is in error in holding that σημεῖον is a *penal sign*, or a sign of *divine judgment*; comp. also Hilgenfeld, p. 21; Rossteuscher, p. 77. This, in fact, is not at all implied in ver. 21, where, on the contrary, the glossolalia appears as a last extraordinary measure remaining likewise *without result*, which will at length make full exposure of the disobedience of the persons in question, but not as a sign of wrath. And had Paul thought of *irae signum*, he must have expressed the *irae* too, and, in fact, brought it emphatically forward.¹ Again Storr, Flatt, Baur, and Dav.

from our passage only thus much, that the glossolalia as regards its nature *could* be described in the way of application by ἐν ἑτερογλώσσοις and ἐν χεῖλεσιν ἐτέρων λαλεῖν, but not that γλ. λαλ. and ἐτέρ. γλ. λαλ. were two current formulae for denoting the speaking with tongues. Hence also we are not, with

Hirzel in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1840, p. 121 ff., to infer from this passage the *originality* of the designation ἐτέραις γλώσσαις λαλεῖν.

¹ According to Billroth’s view, namely, Paul warns the Corinthians that they should not thoughtlessly foster among themselves a thing which is called in the O. T. a *sign of*

Schulz (*Geistesg.* pp. 78, 176) are wrong in saying that the *prevalence of the glossolalia* in the church *was a sign of their unbelief*. This is unsuitable for this reason, that according to vv. 21, 23 we are to conceive as the ἀπίστοι not those who *speak* γλώσσαις, but those who *are spoken to* in γλ. — τοῖς ἀπίστοις] Dative of the reference in view, as is also τοῖς πιστεύουσιν. The conception of the ἀπίστοι, however, is, by virtue of this very antithesis (and see also vv. 23, 24), simply *the non-believing, the unbelievers*,—a conception which is neither to be softened down to that of *non-genuine Christians* or the like (Flatt, David Schulz), nor intensified to that of *obstinate unbelievers*, those wholly *unsusceptible* of faith, infideles *privative* (Neander, Billroth, Rückert). Hirzel in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1840, p. 120 ff. (who is followed in substance by de Wette, Osiander, Maier, Engelmann, and see Bengel's hints of earlier date), understands by the ἀπίστοις those *who do not wish to believe*, and by the πιστεύουσιν those *who wish to believe*.¹ Comp. de Wette: "They are not heard by such *as let themselves be moved thereby to believe*, but by such *as remain unbelieving*." This is conclusively negated by the prevailing use of οἱ πιστεύοντες and οἱ ἀπίστοι, to which any such artificial pregnancy of meaning is quite alien (see immediately, vv. 23, 24). — ἡ δὲ προφητεία κ.τ.λ.] a contrast, which is not intended to be inferred from that passage of Scripture,—which in truth says nothing whatever about the προφητεύειν,—but the truth of which was self-evident to the readers in virtue of an *argumentum e contrario*. We are not, however, to *supply* the simple ἐστί, so that the meaning would be : not to the unbelievers, but to the believers, is the prophetic address to be directed (my own view hitherto), but rather εἰς σημεῖον ἐστίν, for Paul has not written ἐστίν at all, and therefore leaves the predicate of the first half of the verse to operate still in virtue of the antithesis. Consequently : *prophecy is designed to be a sign not for the unbelievers, but for the believers, i.e. in order to make those to whom the prophetic address is directed known as believers*; see ver. 24, where this statement of the apostle is verified by the fact that such as come into the Christian assembly as unbelievers, being won over by the overpowering impression of the prophetic addresses, submit themselves to Christianity and declare themselves believers. Erasmus, Grotius, and Bleek are wrong in holding that οὐ means *non tantum*. The negation is absolute, as in the preceding clause. Comp. Fritzsche, *ad Matth.* p. 784. According to Hirzel (de Wette and Osiander), the meaning here also is alleged to be : *prophecy is given not for such as do not wish to believe, but for such as wish to believe*.

punishment. Comp. Beza and Cornelius à Lapide, also Calovius. Upon this view, Paul must have absolutely *disapproved of* the glossolalia. It would have been a tempting of God by the abuse of a divine sign of curse.

¹ Hofmann also understands by τοῖς ἀπίστοις those *indisposed to believe*. As if Paul would not have known how to express this conception! Hofmann even conceives two classes to be comprehended under τοῖς πιστεύουσιν, namely, those already *standing*

in faith and those who are *becoming* believers, and holds that on this account Paul did not write τοῖς πιστοῖς. As if οἱ πιστεύοντες were not with the apostle quite the usual expression for the *believers* (i. 21; Rom. i. 16, iii. 22, x. 4; Gal. iii. 22; Eph. i. 19, *al.*), who *are* such, but not for those, or so as to include those, who are only *becoming* such. The πιστεύοντες are not at all different from the πιστοῖς (2 Cor. vi. 15; Eph. i. 1; Col. i. 2).

Ver. 23. *What, then, will be the effect of the speaking with tongues, which you all so much desire, upon ungifted persons or unbelievers? If such come into your church when you are assembled together, and get nothing else there to hear from any of you but glossolalia, so far will they be from declaring themselves as believers upon your speaking with tongues, that, on the contrary, they will declare you to be mad.* — οὖν] draws an inference from ver. 22 in such a way that ver. 23 corresponds to the first, and ver. 24 f. to the second half of ver. 22. — πάντες] Paul does not suppose that all those assembled speak together in a confused, tumultuous way (Cornelius à Lapide and others; comp. also Maier), but that all in *succession* hold *glossolaliae*, and *only* such,—not addresses of *any other kind*. For, if all spoke together and confusedly, even in the case of prophecy it could make no impression (ver. 24). — ἰδιῶται] is not to be understood otherwise than in ver. 16: *Christians who are not endowed with glossolalia, or with the gift of understanding it*. The context, however, shows by the foregoing ἐὰν . . . αὐτό that those meant are ungifted persons *from any extraneous church*, who come into the church at Corinth when in full assembly. Were the stranger who entered not an ungifted person, but one who himself spoke with tongues or interpreted, his judgment respecting the gift which he himself possessed or understood would, of course, not take the same form. All explanations which deviate from the meaning of the word in ver. 16 are on that very account to be rejected, such as not only that of most of the old interpreters, with Billroth and Chr. F. Fritzsche: “such as do not understand foreign languages,” but also that of Theodoret, David Schulz, Flatt, Olshausen (also Rückert, although with hesitation): “beginners in Christianity;” comp. Pelagius, Thomas, Estius: “nuper credentes, neophyti;” Melancthon: “rudis qui primum coepit catechismi doctrinam audire,” comp. Neander. Rückert suggests that Paul is supposing the case that the glossolalia should break out somewhere suddenly and for the first time, and there should then come in Christians who knew nothing of it and, not being present, had not been affected by the paroxysm, and non-Christians. But the suggestion is to be dismissed, because there is no mention of the “*suddenly and for the first time*,” which would in that case be the main thing. Hirzel and de Wette hold erroneously, because in opposition to ver. 16,¹ and not to be established even by 2 Cor. xi. 6, that the ἰδιῶται are *non-Christians* (so, too, Ulrich in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1843, p. 420, and Hofmann), in which case they are in various arbitrary ways distinguished from the ἅπιοτοι, namely, by Hirzel² asserting that the ἅπ. are *heathen*, the ἰδ. *Jews*; by de Wette, that the former were still *more aloof* from believing than the latter; by Ulrich, that the ἰδ. were persons *unacquainted with Christianity*, the ἅπ. those *acquainted* with it indeed, *but unbelieving* and (Hofmann) *hostile* towards it. Not the ἰδιῶται, but the ἅπιοτοι, are the non-Christians (who are *never* called ἰδ.), as in ver. 22. We may add that Grotius remarks rightly: “Solebant

¹ For in ver. 23 and ver. 16 the conception of ἰδιῶται is determined by a *like context*—namely, by the *same contrast* to those gifted with the glossolalia. This we remark in

opposition to Hirzel, Ulrich, Hofmann, who assume that ver. 16 cannot regulate the explanation of ἰδιώτης in ver. 23 f.

² Comp. van Hengel, *Gave d. talen*, p. 94.

enim pagani" (and Jews also) "adire Christianorum ecclesias ad videnda quae ibi agebantur." Their admission (certainly not to the Agapae, however) was the less a matter for hesitation, since it might become a means of their conversion. Comp. generally, Harnack, *Gemeindegottesd.* p. 143 ff. — ὅτι μαίνεσθε] *that you* (Christians in Corinth) *are foolish, and out of your senses*, because, namely, you collectively and without exception carry on a kind of converse so unintelligible and meaningless for the hearers. Olshausen strangely holds that the verdict expressed is: "We see, doubtless, that you are possessed by a God; but there is no prophet here; we do not understand what the god says to us!" An unwarranted explaining away of the clear import of the word: μαίνεσθαι means *insanire*, just as in Acts xxvi. 24. The verdict of drunkenness passed by the unbelievers in Acts ii. 13 presents a remarkable analogy. — Observe, further: (1) Here ἰδιῶται is put *first*, and ἄπιστοι *follows*, because the ἰδιῶται, as *Christians*, and therefore *acquainted* with the uselessness and absurdity of the glossolalia without interpretation and to the exclusion of all other (intelligible) discourse, come here into the foreground,¹ and may and will be the first to pass the judgment ὅτι μαίνεσθε; in ver. 24, on the contrary, ἄπιστος stands first, because *conversion* is spoken of, and hence "*praecipue agitur de infideli; idiota obiter additur ob rationem ejus non plane disparem*" (Bengel). (2) In ver. 23, since Paul designs to cite the judgment in the form of an *utterance* (ἐποῦσιν), which is most naturally conceived of by him as a *mutual* communication, the *plural* εἰσέλθωσι κ.τ.λ. presented itself with as much appropriateness as the *singular* εἰσέλθῃ κ.τ.λ. does in ver. 24, where the apostle wishes to *depict specially* the *converting* work, vv. 24, 25, in its course, which, from the nature of the case, is done most befittingly in an *individualizing* representation.

Vv. 24, 25. How wholly different, on the other hand, will the effect of general *prophetic* speaking be upon such persons! Arrested and humbled before God, they will declare themselves believers. — εἰάν δὲ πάντες προφ.] is to be completed in accordance with ver. 23: εἰάν δὲ συνέλθῃ ἡ ἐκκλ. ὅλη ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ κ. πάντες προφ. — ἰδιώτης] according to the context: *one not prophetically gifted*, and, indeed, coming likewise from an extraneous church. Comp. on ver. 23. — Prophecy, from its nature, was generally *intelligible*; but whoever had not its χάρισμα could not *speake* prophetically, and such a one was in presence of this gift an *idiotes*. — ἐλέγχεται ὑπὸ πάντ.] The characteristic power of prophecy (ver. 22), by which you all mutually edify yourselves, thus exercises such an overmastering influence upon his mind, that he is *convinced by all*, i.e. brought to a consciousness of the guilt of his sins. Comp. John xvi. 9. *All* produce this impression upon him, because each speaks prophetically, and the fundamental character of prophetic address—the penetrating into the depths of the human heart for wholesome admonition (comp. ver. 3)—is alike in all. — After the first aggregate impression of the ἐλεγχοίς, he experiences and is conscious of the moral *sifting* and *unveil-*

¹ ἡ ἄπιστοι is omitted in B, because it might appear unsuitable. Buttmann in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1860, p. 370, believes that it

has crept in from ver. 24. But in that case ἄπιστοι would have been *prefixed* (so only Ambrosiaster).

ing of his innermost life. A striking climax. — ἀνακρίνεται] for in the judgment of the human heart, which the prophets deliver, he hears a judgment upon his own heart and his own moral condition. — τὰ κρυπτὰ τῆς καρδίας κ.τ.λ.] i.e. the moving springs, inclinations, plans, etc., of his whole inner active life, which had been hitherto known to no other, are brought to light, inasmuch as the prophets depict the hidden thoughts and strivings of the human spirit, with apocalyptically enlightened depth of insight, so truly and strikingly, that the listener sees the secrets of his own heart laid bare before all who are there present. — καὶ οὕτω] result : *and in such form*, namely, convinced, judged, and made manifest, as has been just said. — ἀπαγγέλλων] *announcing*, i.e. *declaring aloud*, and not first at home (Beza). — ὁντως] *really*, opposite of what is merely pretended or semblance. Comp. Mark xi. 32 ; Gal. iii. 21, *al.* — ἐν ὑμῖν] *in animis vestris*, in which He works this enlightenment and spiritual power. “Argumentum pro veritate religionis ex operationibus divinis efficacissimum” (Bengel). Through this presence of God in the *individuals* (by means of the Spirit) He dwells in the *church*, which thereby is His *temple* (iii. 16 ; 2 Cor. vi. 16 ; Eph. ii. 20 f.).

Ver. 26 ff. The theoretical part regarding the charismata is closed (vv. 1–25). There is now added as its sequel the *regulative part* regarding the proper *application* of the charismata, and (1) of the charismata in general (ver. 26) ; then, in particular, (2) of the glossolalia (vv. 27, 28) ; and (3) of the gift of prophecy (vv. 29–33). Upon this follows, as an appendix, (4) the prohibition of public speaking on the part of women (vv. 34–36). And by way of conclusion, (5) the assertion of apostolic authority for the whole teaching now given (vv. 37, 38) ; and (6) a summary repetition of the chief points (vv. 39, 40).

Ver. 26. τί οὖν ἐστίν ;] as in ver. 15. — The apodosis begins with ἕκαστος, and πάντα οὐ το γινέσθω is a sentence by itself. *As often as you come together, every one* (every one gifted with charismatic speech among you) *has a psalm* ready, i.e. he feels himself qualified and constrained to sing aloud such a spirit-given song. It is not, however, the glossolalia ψάλλειν which is meant, since afterwards γλῶσσαν ἔχει is specially mentioned in addition, but the intelligible singing of praise, which takes place with the νοῦς (comp. ver. 15). Comp. generally on Eph. v. 19. Grotius compares the improvised hymns of Deborah, Simeon, etc. — ἔχει is neither interrogative (Grotius) nor : *he may have* (David Schulz), nor are we to supply in thought with Locke, “ut moram ferre non possit ;” but it simply expresses the state of the case : *in promptu habet*. Bengel rightly judges of the repetition of the ἔχει : “elegantius exprimit divisam donorum copiam.” — διδαχήν] *a doctrinal address*. See on xii. 10, 28. — γλῶσσαν] *a tongue*, i.e. *a spirit-tongue*, which seeks utterance. The matter is so conceived and described as that not every one has the use of *a tongue* in the sense of the glossolalia, but only the man gifted with this charisma, in whom there is present for this purpose a tongue as the organ of the Spirit. — ἀποκάλυψιν] *a revelation*, which he wishes to utter by a prophetic address, comp. ver. 29 f. — ἐρμηνείαν] *an interpretation*, which he wishes to give of an address in a tongue already delivered. — The words ψάλλον το ἔρμ. ἔχει are the separate divisions of the ἕκαστος, as in i. 12. Then

follows the general rule for all these charismata : *all must be done for the furtherance of Christian perfection* (of the church) ! Observe how, according to this passage, public teaching was not restricted to one definite office (κ²) See Ritschl, *altkath. K.* p. 350.

Ver. 27. After this *general* rule come now *particular* precepts : *suppose that one wishes to speak with a tongue* ; comp. γλωσσᾶν ἔχει, ver. 26. There is no other εἴτε to correspond to this εἴτε (*sive*, Vulgate) ; but the plan of sentence first thought of and begun is so disturbed by the apodosis and ver. 28, that it is quite abandoned, and ver. 29, instead of commencing with a new εἴτε, is not even continued in hypothetic form at all. See Maetzner, *ad Antiph.* p. 194. Comp. Klotz, *ad Devar.* p. 538. According to Hofmann (who writes εἰ τε separately), τέ is *annexive*, namely, to πάντα π. οἰκ. γ. In that case εἰ τε would be : *in like manner if* (Hartung, *Partik.* I. p. 106 f.), which, however, would be logically suitable only on the supposition that γλωσσᾶ did not already occur also in ver. 26. — κατὰ δύο κ.τ.λ.] *sc. λαλείτωσαν* (comp. 1 Pet. iv. 11), and this is to be taken declaratively (as in xi. 16) : *let him know that they should speak by two, or at most by three* ; in each assembly not more than two, or at most three, speakers with tongues should come forward. As to the supplying of λαλείτ., see Kühner, II. p. 603 ; Fritzsche *ad Rom.* III. p. 65. — τὸ πλεῖστον] adverbially. See Matthiae, p. 1000. — Καὶ ἀνὰ μέρος, *and that according to order*, one after the other, not several together. See Valck. *ad Phoen.* 481 ; Schweigh. *Lex. Polyb.* p. 380. Doubtless—and this seems to have given occasion for this addition—the case had often occurred in Corinth, that those who spoke with tongues had so little controlled their impulse that several came to speak together. — Καὶ εἰς διερχμ.] *and let one* (not several) *give the interpretation*, of that, namely, which the said two or three speakers with tongues have spoken in succession. Grotius puts it rightly : “ unus aliquis, qui id donum habet ;” and it is plain from vv. 5, 13 (in opposition to Ewald) that the speaker with tongues himself might also be the interpreter. Paul will *not* allow *several* interpreters to speak, because that would have been unnecessary, and would only have shortened the time for the more useful prophetic and other addresses.

Ver. 28. *Should it be case, however, that there is no interpreter present, let him be silent in the assembly.* This comprises the double possibility that the speaker with tongues cannot himself interpret, and also that no other, who possesses the donum interpretandi, is present. Regarding εἶναι as equivalent to παρῆναι, comp. on Mark viii. 1 ; Luke ii. 36. David Schulz understands ἥ as the simple copula : “ if, however, he does not know how to make himself intelligible.” But the interpretation might in fact be given also by another, who had the charisma of the ἐρμηνεία γλωσσῶν, xii. 10, 30. — σιγ. ἐν ἐκκλ.] Paul takes for granted here—and how easily one can understand it, considering the intimate union subsisting among the Christians of those days !—that the members of the community mutually *know* each other as regards their special endowments. — ἐαυτῷ δὲ λαλ. κ. τ. θ.] in contrast to addresses given ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, and hence a characteristic designation of the *private devotion* carried on by means of glossolalic prayer, where his glossolalia avails *for himself and God* (ver. 2), not for others also as listeners.

Comp. Epict. *Diss.* iv. 8. 17, and the similar passages in Wetstein. Others take it to mean : *quietly in his thoughts* (Theophylact, comp. Chrysostom, also Chr. F. Fritzsche), so that it remains on the footing of an inward intercourse between him and his God (Hofmann) ; which, however, is not in keeping with the essential mark of the *λαλεῖν*, *this being uttered aloud*, which belonged to the *matter in hand*.¹ Observe, further, how, even in this highest degree of inspired impulse to speak, a man could control his own will. Comp. ver. 32.

Ver. 29. Δέ] marks the transition to the rule regarding the *prophets*. — The ἀνὰ μέρος (ver. 27) is emphasized in a special way, ver. 30 ; yet Paul does not add αὐτὸ πλεῖστον here, thereby limiting the gift of prophecy less sharply, and tacitly also conceding a plurality of speakers, when the circumstances might perhaps involve an exception from the rule. Still we are not (with Hofmann) to read δύο ἢ τρεῖς as meaning “rather three than two.” — Καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι διακρ.] *and the other prophets*, who do not take part in speaking, *are to judge* : whether, namely, what has been said proceeds really from the Spirit or not. We see from this that the charisma of judging the spirits was joined with that of prophecy, so that whoever could himself speak prophetically was qualified also for the διάκρισις ; for οἱ ἄλλοι (comp. ἄλλω, ver. 30) cannot be taken (with Hofmann) universally, *without* restriction to the category of prophets, seeing that in fact the διάκρισις was no universal χάρισμα. The article is retrospective, so that it is defined by προφῆται. At the same time, however, it must not be overlooked that even such persons as were not themselves prophets might still be endowed with the διάκρισις (xii. 10), although not all were so.

Ver. 30. But two prophets were never to speak *together*. The order ought, on the contrary, to be this, that if a revelation shall have been imparted to another prophet (ἄλλω) while he sits listening, the first shall be silent (not simply *soon* cease, as Neander, Maier, and others would take it ; comp., too, Hofmann) and let the second speak. Paul thus does not enjoin that the second shall wait until the first is finished, to which meaning Grotius, Storr, and Flatt twist the words (comp. vv. 28, 34) ; on the contrary, he attaches more importance to the fresh undelayed outburst of prophetic inspiration, than to the further continuance of the address after the first outburst. — καθημ.] for the prophets spoke *standing*, Luke iv. 17. See Grotius *in loc.*

Ver. 31 f. Establishment of this precept by setting forth the possibility of its observance. The principal emphasis is laid upon δύνασθε, which is for this reason placed first (not upon πάντες, as Rückert holds), for in it lies the pith of the proof. Next to it πάντες has the emphasis. The sense is : “*For in my ὁ πρῶτος σιγ. I am enjoining nothing which is impossible for you ; on the contrary, it stands in your power that, one after another, you may all come to give a prophetic address.*” etc. — καθ’ ἓνα] *always one at a time, singulativim*. Acts xxi. 19 ; see Ast, *Lex. Plat.* I. p. 639 f. ; Bernhardt, p. 240. The

¹ Besides, it was self-evident that, *where silence was enjoined*, a man did not need to

be in the first instance remitted to quiet inward fellowship with God.

subject addressed in δύνασθε is the *prophets* in the church, not the *members of the church generally* (Hofmann), seeing that prophecy was a special χάρισμα¹ which did not belong to all (see xii. 29 ; Acts xiii. 1 ; Eph. iv. 11). The inspiration of the prophets does not compel them to speak on without a break, so as not to allow another to take speech at all or to speak alone, but it is in their power to cease when another begins, so that by degrees all may come to speak—not, of course, in the same assembly (ver. 29), but in successive meetings. — And this circumstance, that καθ' ἓνα πάντες προφητεύουσι, has for its *design* (ἵνα), that all the members of the church (which includes also other *prophets* along with the rest) *may learn*, etc., that none may remain without instruction and encouragement. For modes of prophetic inspiration, very different from each other in substance and form, will then find expression, whereby satisfaction will be given to the most different wants. — μανθάνωσι] what God has revealed to those speaking prophetically. — παρακλ.] *be encouraged, aroused*. Comp. παράκλησιν, ver. 3. Paul describes here the effects of prophecy from the *theoretical* (μανθ.) and *practical* (παρακαλ.) sides. The latter he had already stated more *especially* in ver. 3.

Ver. 32. The second part of the establishment of the precept (γάρ, ver. 31). *And prophets' spirits are obedient to prophets*. The indicative presents the normal relationship *as it is*, not *as it ought to be* (Olshausen and others). — πνεύματα προφ.] cannot be *workings* of the Divine Spirit in the prophets (Chrysostom, Erasmus, Estius, and others, including Flatt, comp. de Wette), nor does it mean the spirits *which the prophets have received*, so that the one πνεῦμα appears as if divided among them (Rückert), or created angelic spirits in the service of the Holy Spirit (Hahn, *Theol. d. N. T.* p. 307), or even actually several Holy Spirits (Hilgenfeld ; see, however, on ver. 12) ; but (comp. the genitival relation, ver. 14) it is *the prophets' own spirits, filled, however, by the Holy Spirit*. Persons prophetically inspired are, as such, raised to a higher spiritual potency, and have *prophets' spirits*. Comp. Rev. xxii. 6, and Düsterdieck *in loc.* But their free-will is not thereby taken away, nor does the prophetic address become something involuntary, like a Bacchantic enthusiasm ; no, prophets' spirits stand in obedience to prophets ; he who is a prophet has the power of will over his spirit, which makes the ὁ πρῶτος σιγάτω in ver. 30² possible ; ἐπὶ τοῖς προφήταις ἐστὶ τὸ σιγᾶν ἢ λαλεῖν, Theophylact. Comp. Hofmann *in loc.*, and *Schriftbew.* I. p. 312. Others, again (Theophylact gives both interpretations alongside of each other), refer προφήταις to *other* prophets : τὸ ἐν σοὶ χάρισμα . . . ὑποτάσσεται τῷ χαρίσματι τοῦ ἑτέρου τοῦ κινηθέντος εἰς τὸ προφητεύειν, Theophylact. So Theodoret, Calvin, Calovius, Estius, Rosenmüller, and others, including Hey-

¹ It is not correct to say, "on the contrary, *whoever receives a revelation becomes a prophet*" (Hofmann) ; for the prophetic endowment is *habitual*, belonging to one and not to another. Whoever *has* it receives revelations to be communicated for the edification of others ; he is the vessel divinely prepared for this reception and

communication.

² Comp. Luther in the gloss : ' They should and may well give place, since the gifts of the Spirit stand under their control, not to use them in opposition to unity, so that they may not say that the Spirit drives and compels them.'

denreich, Bleek, Rückert, and Ritschl, *althath. K.* p. 473. But if Paul had conceived of the prophet's becoming silent as conditioned by the will of another, and so *objectively*,—which the expression, taken simply in itself, might imply,—then plainly his admonition ὁ πρῶτος σιγάτω would be entirely superfluous. He must, on the contrary, have conceived of it as conditioned *subjectively* by the will of the subjects themselves who spoke ; and with this our view alone accords, which is found in as early expositors as Origen, Jerome, and Oecumenius. — The *absence of the article* in the case of all the three words depends upon the fact that the relation is conceived not *in concreto*, but *generically*. — Observe, further, the strict, measured form of expression, πνεύματα προφητῶν προφήταις, which is designed not simply for rhetorical emphasis, but for definiteness and clearness of meaning, separating the prophets' *spirits* from the *subjects* who have them. Αὐτοῖς would not have marked this so strongly.

Ver. 33. Establishment of ver. 32 on religious grounds. “For how could God have appointed it otherwise, seeing that by Him is produced not *confusion* (as would be the case if every prophet had to speak on involuntarily), but *peace* !” Comp. Rom. xv. 33, xvi. 20 ; Phil. iv. 9 ; 1 Thess. v. 23. The antithesis is correct, for the ἀκαταστασία would bring with it a jealous and unyielding disposition.

Ver. 34. Appendix to the regulative section regarding the gifts of the Spirit (vv. 26–33) : directed *against the public speaking of women*. Corinthian women, with their freer mood inclined towards emancipation (comp. xi. 2 ff.), must have presumed on this. — ὥς ἐν πάσ. τ. ἐκκλ. τ. ἀγ.] is referred by the Fathers and most of the older expositors, Rückert, Osiander, Neander, Maier, to what precedes (comp. iv. 17, vii. 17, xi. 16). But since the preceding οὐ γὰρ . . . εἰρήνης is quite general, and hence contains no special point of reference for ὥς (for which reason this ὥς has been got rid of in various ways, and even διδάσκω has been added in some codd. and versions) ; since, on the other hand, the passage which follows offers this point of reference in the fact of its being a command *for the Corinthians* ; and since ver. 36 manifestly glances back at the argument implied in ἐν π. τ. ἐκκλ. τ. ἀγ.,—therefore it is preferable to connect the clause with what follows, as is done by Cajetan and most modern expositors : *As in all church assemblies of the saints, your women ought to be silent in the church assemblies.* (L²)

To place a comma, with Lachmann, *before τῶν ἀγίων*, puts an incongruous emphasis upon τῶν ἀγ. — Regarding the matter itself (1 Tim. ii. 11), comp. the parallels from Greek, Roman, and Rabbinical writers in Wetstein *in loc.* ; Vitranga, *Synag.* p. 724 ; Schoettgen, *Horae*, p. 658. — οὐ γὰρ ἐπιτρέπεται] *for it is* (permanently) *not allowed*. To take ἐπιτρέπεσθαι as *mandari* (Reiche) would be linguistically correct in itself, but against the usage of the whole N.T. (comp. xvi. 7 ; 1 Tim. ii. 12). — ἀλλ' ὑποτάσσεσθαι] namely, *is incumbent upon them*, in accordance with a current Greek brevity of expression. Comp. 1 Tim. iv. 3 ; see Kühner, II. p. 604 f. ; Dissen, *ad Demosth. de Cor.* p. 222 f. The ὑποτάσσεσθαι excludes, in Paul's view, the speaking in the assemblies, inasmuch as the latter appears to him as an act of uncomplying independence. — ὁ νόμος] Gen. iii. 16.

Ver. 35. Even questions for their instruction should not be brought forward by the women in the assemblies. — ἐν οἴκῳ] has the emphasis. *At home*, not in the assembly, they are to obtain for themselves by inquiry the desired instruction, and that from those to whom they, *as women*, are naturally referred, from *their own husbands*.

Ver. 36. ἡ joins on to what is immediately before prescribed, not to the previous directions in general (de Wette, Osiander, *et al.*). “It is disgraceful for a woman to speak in public, unless, perhaps, you were the first or the only Christian church, in which cases then, doubtless, your custom would show that disgracefulness to be a mistake, and would authorize as becoming the speaking of women by way of an example for other churches !” μὴ τοίνυν τοῖς οἰκείοις ἀρκείσθε, ἀλλὰ ταῖς τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν νομοθεσίαις ἀκολουθεῖτε, Theodoret ; but the *point* of the expression, as against the Corinthian haughtiness, is very palpable. — αἰσχρόν] ἐπειδὴ καλλωπίζεσθαι ἐντεῦθεν ἐνόμιζον ἐκ τοῦ φθέγγεσθαι δημοσίᾳ, πάλιν εἰς τὸ ἐναντίον περιάγει τὸν λόγον, Chrysostom. Comp. xi. 5 f. Paul is decided against all undue exaltation and assumption on the part of women in religious things, and it has been the occasion of much evil in the church.

Ver. 37. He now, after the digression regarding the women, adds the authority of Christ to the section upon the charismata, which has been already previously brought to a conclusion, but to which he looks back once more. — δοκεῖ] If any one *represents himself* (iii. 18, viii. 2, x. 12) to be a prophet, or spiritually gifted in any way, then let him also prove himself to be such by his recognizing, etc. Not to acknowledge this would show him to be not a prophet or not inspired. — πνευματικός] quite general : “*dotibus Sp. St. instructus* ;” not, as Billroth, David Schulz, Baur, and Wieseler would have it, equivalent to γλ. λαλῶν (comp. on xii. 1, xiv. 1). Ἡ is : *or generally*. Hofmann is wrong in saying that the ἡ is not suited for thus linking on a general statement. Why not ? Comp. iv. 3 ; Luke xii. 11 ; Matt. xvi. 14. There is all the less reason for assuming, with Hofmann, that Paul uses the expression in the vaguer sense of one *going even beyond the prophet*, because he had found it so used in the letter from Corinth. — ἀ γράφω ὑμ.] refers to *the whole section regarding the πνευματικοῖς*. To refer it, as Billroth and Olshausen do, to the command that the women should keep silence, does not harmonize with the introduction εἰ τις . . . πνευματικός, and involves the awkwardness of only this intervening matter being thus confirmed with such solemnity, and the principal and far more important section not at all. — κυρίου ἐστίν (see the critical remarks) : *proceed from the Lord*. In his communion of spirit with *Christ*, Paul was conscious that what he had been writing, from chap. x. onwards, regarding spiritual gifts and the right use of them, was the result not of his own meditation and desire, but of the working of Christ upon him—that he wrote as an *interpretes Christi*. There is thus no reason for making κυρίου refer to *God* (Grotius, Billroth, Olshausen), seeing that Christ had in fact given no rules regarding the charismata. Paul is affixing here the seal of *apostolic* authority, and upon that seal we must read *Christ*.

Ver. 38. Ἀγνοεῖ] namely, ἀ γράφω ὑμῖν, ὅτι κ.τ.λ., ver. 37. His not being

willing to know, or the *attitude of wrongly knowing* (Hofmann), is not conveyed in the word, but is *presupposed*. — ἀγνοεῖτω] *permissive*, denotes the renunciation of all endeavours to instruct such an one who lets himself be puffed up. It is the opposite of the ἐπιγινώσκειν, ver. 37. Estius puts it well : “Sibi suaeque ignorantiae relinquendos esse censeo.” Comp. xi. 16. (M²)

Vv. 39, 40. Gathering up (ὥστε, “*itaque*, *summa*,” Bengel) the main points of the whole discussion, and that (1) of its theoretical (ver. 39), and (2) of its regulative part (ver. 40). — Paul has aptly indicated the value of the glossolalia relatively to the prophetic gift by ζηλοῦτε (comp. ver. 12, xii. 31) and μὴ κωλύετε, without there being any ground, however, for inferring from this an attitude of hostility on the side of the Pauline party towards those who spoke with tongues (Baur, Rübiger, comp. at an earlier date Storr). — ἐν σχημόνως] *in a seemly way* (Rom. xiii. 13 ; 1 Thess. iv. 12), denoting ecclesiastical *decorum*. — κατὰ τάξιν] in accordance with *order* (see Wetstein), so that it is done at the right time, and in the right measure and limits. (N²) Comp. Clem. *ad Cor.* I. 40, also what Josephus, *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8. 5, says of the Essenes : οὔτε κραυγή ποτε τὸν οἶκον, οὔτε θόρυβος μολύνει, τὰς δὲ λαλίας ἐν τάξει παραχωροῦσιν ἀλλήλοις.

NOTES BY AMERICAN EDITOR.

(G²) *The tongues were edifying.* Ver. 5.

It shows also that the contents of the discourses delivered in an unknown tongue were edifying. They did not consist of ecstatic but unintelligible and unintelligent outpourings of the heart before God, for if that were the case interpretation would be manifestly impossible.

(H²) *How shall he . . . say the Amen?* Ver. 16.

The practice of giving the audible response was borrowed from the synagogue, in which all the worshippers were expected to utter the Amen with such heartiness as to show that they entered fully into what was said. Principal Brown says justly that those churches have not done well who have dropped out the audible response, the uttered Amen, of the congregation, by which alone they have it in their power to express their cordial sympathy with what is uttered in prayer by the officiating minister.

(I²) *The unknown is unedifying.* Ver. 17.

Many commentators take occasion from this passage to reprove the custom in the Roman Church of using the Latin language in her public services. For the very thing here prohibited is praying in public in a language which the people do not understand. “It is indeed said that words may touch the feelings which do not convey any distinct notions to the mind. But we cannot say Amen to those words any more than we can to a flute. Such blind emotional worship, if such it can be called, stands at a great remove from the intelligent service demanded by the apostle” (Hodge).

(J²) "*In the law it is written.*" Ver. 21.

It may well be doubted whether it is wise to insist upon interpreting this quotation typically. It is better, with Stanley, Hodge, and Beet, to take it as a simple reference to an event in Jewish history from which a useful lesson could be drawn. As the Jews had refused to hear the prophets speaking in their own language, God threatened to bring upon them a people whose language they could not understand. This was a judgment, a mark of displeasure, designed as a punishment and not for their conversion. Hence the Apostle wishes the Corinthians to learn that it was no token of God's favour to have teachers whose language they could not understand. Their childish zeal for tongues was simply turning a blessing into a curse.

(K²) *Public teaching not restricted to one definite office.* Ver. 26.

This is true, yet the circumstances are to be considered. While the extraordinary gifts of tongues, prophecy, and the like continued, any member present who experienced the working of the Spirit in these manifestations was authorized to exercise his gift. And all that Paul does is to lay down the general rule that everything should be done unto edifying. But manifestly, after the gifts ceased, no one would have the right, simply under the impulse of his own mind, to rise in the church and take part in its services.

(L²) "*As in all the churches,*" etc. Ver. 34.

Alford, Principal Brown, Westcott and Hort insist upon the old patristic usage of connecting this clause with what precedes, but not wisely. So understood, the words have no pertinent sense, for the Apostle would hardly undertake to uphold a conceded and undeniable truth by an appeal to the authority or experience of the church. On the other hand, to make such an appeal in favour of what he says in the 34th verse is both pertinent in itself and consonant with the Apostle's own practice, as stated in xi. 16, "we have no such custom," etc. The Revision of 1881 follows the old practice.

(M²) "*Let him be ignorant.*" Ver. 38.

The Revised Version gives in the margin, "he is not known," according to a reading found in several uncials and read apparently by Origen. But as the documentary evidence is fairly divided, and the indicative reading would be very hard to expound, it is better to adhere to the received text, the sense of which is a contemptuous expression of indifference to the opinion of opposers or an affirmation that to argue further with such persons would be a waste of time.

(N²) "*Decently and in order.*" Ver. 40.

Decently, *i.e.* becomingly, in such a way as not to offend against propriety. Dean Stanley says that this direction, and that given in ver. 26, "Let all things be done unto edifying," are the only rubrics of the primitive church. And they are of universal and perpetual authority.

CHAPTER XV.

Ver. 10. ἡ σὺν ἐμοί] Lachm. has merely σὺν ἐμοί, following B D* F G S* Vulg. It. Or. Ambrosiast. Aug. Rightly; the article was inserted, doubtless, in some cases in a mere mechanical way after ἡ εἰς ἐμέ, but in others purposely, in order to have a thoroughly complete contrast to οὐκ ἐγώ, at the suggestion of dogmatic interest, which also produced the weakly attested reading ἡ ἐν ἐμοί. The ἡ is wanting also before εἰς ἐμέ in D* F G, Vulg. It. and Latin Fathers. But here there was nothing in the context to occasion the insertion, and the article could be dispensed with, and was thus overlooked. — Ver. 14. κενὴ καί] Elz., Scholz, Tisch. read κενὴ δὲ καί, against greatly preponderating testimony. — Ver. 19. ἐν Χριστῷ] stands before ἡλπιότες in A B D* E F G S, min. Vulg. It. Goth. and several Fathers. So Lachm. Rück. Tisch. and rightly, for this position is not easier than that of the *Recepta*, and hence the great preponderance of the evidence is all the more decisive. — Ver. 20. After κεκοιμ. Elz. has ἐγένετο, against decisive evidence; a supplementary addition. — Ver. 21. ὁ θάνατος] The article is wanting in A B D* K S, Or. Dial. c. Marc. Cyr. Dam. al. Rightly deleted by Lachm. and Rück. From Rom. v. 12. — Ver. 24. Instead of the *Recepta* παραδῶ, which Reiche defends, B F G have παραδίδοι, and A D E S, min. Fathers παραδιδῶ; the former preferred by Lachm. and Tisch., the latter by Rück. Παραδιδῶ, or the παραδίδοι, which is likewise to be taken as a subjunctive form (there is no means of deciding between the two), is correct (see the exegetical remarks); ὅταν καταργήσῃ, however, made the aorist come very naturally to the transcribers, who did not apprehend the different relations of the two clauses. — Ver. 25. — ἂν before θῆ (in Elz. and Scholz) is omitted in preponderant authorities, and has come in from the LXX. Ps. cx. 1. — Ver. 29. αὐτῶν] Elz. reads τῶν νεκρῶν, against decisive evidence; a correct gloss. — Ver. 31. ὑμετέραν] A, min. Or. have ἡμετέραν. So Rück. But the former not being understood, the latter appeared to be required by ἦν ἔχω. — After καύχησιν Lachm. and Tisch. have ἀδελφοί, on the testimony of A B K S, min. vss. and Latin Fathers. Rightly; it is in keeping with the impassioned address, but was easily overlooked by the transcribers, since no new section of the address begins here (comp. on xi. 2). — Ver. 36. ἄφρον] Lachm. Rück. Tisch. read ἄφρων, following A B D E G S, min. The former is a correction. — Ver. 39. Before ἀνθρώπων Elz. has σάρξ again, which is deleted by Griesb. and the later editors, in accordance with decisive evidence. — ἰχθύων, ἄλλη δὲ πτηνῶν] A preponderance of authority—and this alone can decide here—has it in the inverse order πτηνῶν . . . ἰχθύων. So Rück., also Lachm. and Tisch., who, however, read σάρξ again before πτην., which has, it is true, important attestation, but is a mechanical addition. Paul repeated σάρξ in connection with the *first* kind of animals only, and so arranged his enumeration. — Ver. 44. ἐστι σῶμα κ.τ.λ.] εἰ ἐστὶν σῶμα ψ., ἐστὶν καὶ πνευματ. occurs in A B C D* F G S, min., and several vss. and Fathers. Recommended by Griesb., adopted by Lachm. Rück. Tisch. And how easily the form of the preceding clauses might occasion the passing

over of the εἰ, which, besides, was so exposed to omission from the way in which the following word begins (ΕἰΕστίιν). — Ver. 47. After ὁ δεύτερος ἄνθρ. Elz. and Scholz have ὁ κύριος, in opposition to B C D* E F G S* 17, 67** and several vss. and Fathers. Suspected by Griesb., deleted by Lachm. Rück. Tisch. A gloss. See Reiche, *Comm. crit.* I. p. 294 ff. — Ver. 49. φορέσομεν] Lachm. reads φορέσωμεν, following A C D E F G K L S, and many min. Copt. Slav. Vulg. It. Goth. Theodot. Or. (ed. de la Rue) Method. Bas. Chrys. Cyr. Macar. Epiph. Damasc. Ir. Tert. Cypr. Hilar. Zeno, Ambrosiast. Jer. Pel. *al.* A great preponderance of testimony! Nevertheless, the very ancient *Recepta* still retains the important attestation of B and many min. Syr. utr. Arr. Aeth. Arm. Or. ed. Theodoret; Oec. and Theophyl. give and explain both readings. The *Recepta* is to be retained, because it is *necessary* in the connection (see the exegetical remarks); the subjunctive is *unsuitable*, but was easily brought into the text from the fact that σὰρξ κ. αἷμα in ver. 50 was taken in the *ethical* sense (see especially Chrys.); as in the *physical* sense, indeed, it would have stood in opposition to the doctrine of the “*resurrectio carnis*.” Φορέσομεν was first of all *interpreted* as hortative (which interpretation Theodoret felt it necessary expressly to reject), and then the hortative form of the verb was inserted in the text. — Ver. 50. κληρονομεῖ] Lachm. reads κληρονομήσει, following C* D* F G, Vulg. It. and Latin Fathers. Occasioned by the similarity of sound of the preceding κληρονομήσαι. — Ver. 51.¹ πάντες μὲν . . . ἀλλὰ γ.] Lachm. reads πάντες [μὲν] κοιμηθ., οὐ πάντες δὲ ἀλλὰ γ. Altogether there are many variations, but all of them arose from the offence which was taken, in connection with the reading of the text, at the idea of Paul and his readers having all of them undergone death. The *Recepta* occurs in B (which merely omits μὲν) D** E K L almost all min. codd. in Jer. *al.* Goth. Syr. utr. Copt. Aeth. Arr. and many Fathers, an attestation which, considering how the readings otherwise vary, is a very strong one, although among the uncials C G S support Lachm. — Ver. 54. Both the omission of the first part of the protasis (in S* also) and the transposition of the two clauses are insufficiently attested, and are to be explained from the homoeoteleuta. — Ver. 55. νῆκος is put first and κέντρον last by B C J S, 17, 64, 71, Copt. Aeth. Arm. Slav. ms. Vulg. and several Fathers. So Lachm. Rück. But they are evidently transposed, after the LXX. in Hos. xiii. 14. — Instead of ᾄδῃ, B C D E F G J S* 39, 67** and several vss. and Fathers have θάνατε again. So Lachm. Rück. Tisch.; and rightly, for ᾄδῃ has come in from the LXX.

CONTENTS.²—Disquisition on *the resurrection of the dead*, occasioned by the deniers of it in Corinth (ver. 12). That these deniers had been formerly *Sadducees*, and had brought forward again their Sadducean views in connection with Christianity (so recently Flatt, following Heumann, Michaelis, Storr, Knapp; and comp. earlier, Calvin, and Lightfoot; *Chron.* p. 110) is not to be assumed, partly because, in general, Sadduceeism and Christianity

¹ See on the passage Reiche, *Comment. crit.* I. p. 297 ff., who defends the *Recepta* with thoroughness and triumphant success. Tischendorf also has retained it, deleting only the μὲν (which is certainly open to the suspicion of being an addition).

² See regarding the whole chapter, W. A. van Hengel, *Commentar. perpet. in 1 Cor.* xv.

cum epistola ad Winerum, Sylvae ducis, 1851; Krauss, *theol. Kommentar z. 1 Kor.* XV., Frauenfeld 1864 (who stands, however, in express antagonism to grammatico-historical exegesis). Comp. also Klöpffer, *zur paulin. Lehre v. d. Aufersteh.* in the *Jahrb. f. D. Theol.* 1862, p. 1 ff.

are too much antagonistic in their nature to mingle with each other, and also because in that case Paul could not have based his refutation upon the resurrection of Christ (Acts iv. 2). Nor is it more probable that the opponents had been *Epicureans*, for it is plain from vv. 32–34 that the Epicurean turn which they had taken was not the *ground*, but the *consequence* of their denial of the resurrection ; as, indeed, Epicureanism in general is such an antichristian element that, supposing it had been the source of the denial, Paul would certainly have entered upon a discussion of its principles, in so far as they were opposed to faith in the resurrection. It is certain at the same time that the deniers were *not Jewish Christians* ; for with them the belief in the Messiah stood in the most necessary connection with the belief in the resurrection ; comp. Acts xxiii. 6. On the contrary, it must have been *Gentile Christians* (Baur, de Wette, van Hengel, Ewald, and many others) to whom the resurrection seemed *impossible*, and who therefore (vv. 35, 36) denied it. And it is probable, at all events, that they were persons of *philosophical* training (Beza, Grotius, Estius, and others, including Ziegler, *theol. Abh.* II. p. 35 f., Neander, Olshausen, Osiander ; Rückert is undecided), because they must in asserting their thesis, *ὅτι ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν οὐκ ἔστιν*, have caused some sensation, which, in such a place as Corinth, is hardly conceivable on the part of men strangers to any degree of philosophical education and practice in dialectics ; and because the anti-materialistic explanation of the matter, which Paul gives to combat the doubts of his opponents (ver. 35 ff.), makes it probable that the antagonism on the part of the sceptics was a spiritualistic one, *i.e.* an antagonism resting on the philosophic ground that the restoration of the matter of the body was impossible. That the apostle does not contend at the same time against the world's wisdom in general (a doubt expressed by de Wette) is the less strange, as he has to do now with a special subject, and had also already delivered a general polemic of this nature, chap. ii. 3. The small number, however, of men philosophically trained (i. 26) permits of no further inference than that the sceptics in question also were not numerous (*τινές*, ver. 12). In Athens, too (Acts xvii. 32), the resurrection of the dead was the stone of stumbling for philosophic culture ; and how often has it been so since, and even to the present day ! —*But to which of the four parties in Corinth did these deniers belong ?* That they were not of the Petrine or Judaistic party is self-evident. Neither were they of the Christ-party (as Neander, Olshausen, Jäger, and Goldhorn hold them to have been), for Christ had so often and so distinctly taught the doctrine of resurrection of the body, that the denial of it would have been at the most palpable variance with the *ἐγὼ Χριστοῦ εἶμι*. Nor yet were they of the party of Paul, seeing that the doctrine of the resurrection was a most essential article of the Pauline Gospel. There remains, therefore, only the *party of Apollos* (so also Rübiger and Maier), some of whom having been converted, doubtless, only after the apostle had ceased to labour in Corinth, or having come thither subsequently from other quarters, may have found what he had taught in Corinth regarding the resurrection of the dead not compatible with their philosophical standpoint, and hence—being the more incited to it, perhaps, through party variance—altogether denied that there

was a resurrection of the dead.¹ Only we must not take this to mean that the adherents of Apollos *as such*—their *party* as such—had denied the resurrection, and that accordingly this denial formed part of their *party principles*,² but only that the “some” (ver. 12) were preponderantly from the number of those who had attached themselves to Apollos and to the party named after him. Of the idea that the denial was a *party matter*, there is not only no trace whatever in the treatment of the subject, but it would also conflict with what is a necessary presupposition, namely, that the Christianity of the Apollos-party as such cannot have stood in such an essential and real contradiction in point of doctrine to that of Paul. We may add that the denial in question is not to be regarded as a theory, such as we find in 2 Tim. ii. 17 f., in the case of Hymenaeus and Philetus, who understood the doctrine allegorically, and maintained that the resurrection had already taken place. So, following Chrysostom, Grotius, Usteri, *Lehrbegr.* p. 362, Billroth, and Olshausen. The whole elaborate treatment of the subject does not show the slightest trace of this (see, on the contrary, especially ver. 12), although the main aim in that case would have been to prove that the resurrection was not a thing past, but something future.

Vv. 1–11. Foundation for the following argument. The latter enlarges upon the resurrection *itself* as far as ver. 34, and then upon the *manner* of it from ver. 35 to ver. 54, after which triumph and exhortation, vv. 55–58, form the conclusion. — The *certainty of the resurrection of Jesus* was not doubted even by his opponents, who must otherwise have given up the whole historic basis of Christianity, and must have been treated by the apostle as apostates (comp. Ziegler, *theol. Abh.* II. p. 93 ; Knapp, *Ser. var. arg.* p. 316 ; Rübiger, p. 154 f.); for only in this way was that fact capable of serving him for a firm starting-point for his argument with the view of reducing the deniers *ad absurdum*. For this reason he sets forth the resurrection of Jesus in its certainty not polemically, but as a purely positive proposition.

Vv. 1, 2. Δέ] forming the transition to a new subject. There is no trace, however, of a *question* on the part of the Corinthians, to which Paul is giving the *answer*. — γνωρίζω] not, as is *commonly* held, equivalent to ὑπομνήσκω (Oecumenius), nor yet, as Rückert weakens the force of the word : *I call your attention to* ; but : *I make known to you* (xii. 3 ; 2 Cor. viii. 1 ; Gal. i. 2 ; Eph. i. 9 ; Col. iv. 7, *al.*). It is, no doubt, *in substance* a reminding them

¹ That they denied also the continued life of the spirit after death, which Calvin expressly leaves undecided, cannot be maintained, with Flatt and others, from passages such as vv. 19, 29, 30–32, 58. On the contrary, these passages show merely this, that Paul attached no value to the continued life of the souls in Hades, regarded in itself, and not ended by the resurrection. It was to him a *vita non vitalis* (comp. Kling in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1839, p. 502), and the true everlasting ζωή was conditioned for him by the near Parousia and resurrection. This, at the same time, serves to correct

what is asserted by Rückert and others, that in Paul's mind, as in that of the Jews and Pharisees, the ideas of continued existence and of resurrection were so blended into each other, that whoever denied the one seemed not to be capable of holding fast the other. According to Phil. i. 21, 23 (comp. also 2 Cor. v. 8 ; Acts vii. 59), Paul has the conviction that if he should die as a martyr, he would pass, not into Hades, but to Christ in heaven, into a blessed intermediate state until the resurrection of the body. See on Phil. *l.c.*

² Comp. also Krauss, p. 12.

of something already known, but the *expression* is more emphatic, more arousing, putting to shame a part of the readers, and accordant with the fundamental importance of what is now to be discussed. — τὸ εὐαγγ.] is not simply the tidings of the death and resurrection of Jesus (Heydenreich, Rückert, and others), but *the Christian tidings of salvation generally*, because there is here no limiting definition, and as is further in particular clear from ἐν πρώτοις in ver. 3. — ὁ καὶ παρελ. κ.τ.λ.] *which you have also received*. The thrice used καὶ denotes with ever increasing emphasis the element to be added¹ to the preceding one. — Regarding παρελ., comp. John i. 11 ; Phil. iv. 9 ; and regarding ἐστήκ., *you stand, are firm*, x. 12 ; Rom. v. 2 ; 2 Cor. i. 24 ; Eph. vi. 13 ; 1 Pet. v. 12 ; John viii. 44. — σώζεσθε] pictures as present the future, quite certain Messianic salvation. Comp. on i. 18. — τίνι λόγῳ . . . κατέχετε] condition to σώζεσθε, in which τίνι λόγῳ εὐηγγ. ὑμ. is put first for the sake of emphasis. Comp. vi. 4, xi. 14, xiv. 7, 9. Comp. also Plato, *Pol.* i. p. 347 D : πόλις ἀνδρῶν ἀγαθῶν εἰ γένοιτο, *Parm.* p. 136 A ; Baruch iii. 13, as indeed in general it is common in the classics (Stallbaum, *ad Plat. Phaedr.* p. 238 A) and in the N. T. (Buttmann, *neut. Gr.* p. 334 [E. T. 390]) for such words as ought to follow the conjunctions to precede them for the sake of emphasis. Hence : *through which* (by means of faith in its contents) *you also obtain salvation, if you hold fast with what word I preached it to you*. Not without design does he add this condition to the σώζεσθε ; for his readers were threatened with the danger of being led by the deniers of the resurrection to become untrue to the specific contents of his preaching. Others (including Bengel, Heydenreich, Billroth, van Hengel, Ewald) regard τίνι λόγῳ εὐηγγ. ὑμ. as a more precise definition of τὸ εὐαγγ. ὁ εὐηγγ. ὑμ. in accordance with the common form of attraction οἶδά σε τίς εἰ (Winer, p. 581 [E. T. 781]). (o) Against this, however, it may be urged : (1) that the meaning : “ *I make known to you . . . if you still hold it fast,*” contains in the latter half (which is not to be transmuted, with van Hengel, into the sense : “ *si curae nobis cordique est quod nunc dico*”) a condition which stands in no logical relation to the first half ; (2) that εἰ κατέχετε would be at variance with ἐν ᾧ καὶ ἐστήκατε ; (3) that we should then have to assume for ἐκτὸς εἰ μὴ εἰκῇ ἐπιστ. the inadmissible (see below) reference to κατέχετε. All these difficulties fall away with the above interpretation, according to which παρελάβετε expresses the historical act of reception ; ἐστήκατε, the present faithfulness ; σώζεσθε, the certain blessed future ; and εἰ κατέχετε, the abiding condition of the attainment of this end ; while ἐκτὸς εἰ μὴ εἰκῇ ἐπιστ. in turn denotes the exaltation above every doubt in respect of the Messianic salvation really to be attained under this condition. — τίνι λόγῳ] not as in Acts x. 29, *with what ground* (Wetstein, Kypke, Heydenreich, and others, following Theodorus of Mopsuestia and Pelagius), which Osiander views as *scriptural ground* ; for παρέδωκα γὰρ ὑμ. κ.τ.λ., ver. 3, gives, in fact, not a ground, but the *contents* of the preaching. Hence also it does not refer to the “ *manner and method* of the proclamation” (Neander), but

¹ Calovius says rightly : “ Sequuntur haec se invicem : evangelii annuntiatio, annuntiatī per fidem susceptio, suscepti in fide per-

severanti conservatio, perque illud fide susceptum et conservatum aeterna salvatio.”

means : *through what word*, i.e. *preaching what*. As regards *τίνι*, instead of a relative, see Buttmann, *neut. Gr.* p. 216 [E. T. 251]. How different from the seductive discourses of the deniers had this *λόγος* of the apostle been ! According to Hofmann, *τίνι λόγῳ* is meant to be *interrogative*, and that in the sense of “*with what presupposition*,” while *εἰ κατέχετε* and *εἰ μὴ εἰκῇ ἐπιστ.* are the *answer* to it. Against this it may be urged : (1) that, since *εἰ μὴ εἰκ. ἐπιστ.* would be a second condition, Paul would have marked the connection in an intelligible way by *καί* (putting therefore either *καὶ εἰ* or *καί* by itself, but not simply *εἰ*) ; (2) that *λόγος*, in the sense of *condition* or *presupposition*, is foreign to the N. T. and peculiar to Herodotus, who, however, always expresses *sub conditione* by *ἐπὶ τῷ λόγῳ* ; see Schweighäuser, *Lex. Herod.* II. p. 79 f. — *εἰ κατέχετε*] This implies not merely the *not having forgotten* ; it is the *believing firm retention*, which does not let go the doctrine received—the continuance of the *ἐστήκατε*. Comp. Luke viii. 15 ; 1 Cor. xi. 2. And there is not so much an “*aculeus ad pungendum*” (Calvin) in this as an admonition of the *danger*. — *ἐκτὸς εἰ μὴ εἰκῇ ἐπιστ.*] through which you are also saved, if you hold fast my word,—*unless that ye have become believing in vain*, without any result. Only in this case, inconceivable to the Christian consciousness (Beza aptly says : “*argumentatur ab absurdo*”), would ye, in spite of that holding fast, lose the *σωτηρία*. The words therefore imply the *certainty* of the *σώζεσθαι* to be expected under the condition of the *κατέχειν*. On *εἰκῇ*, comp. Gal. iii. 4, iv. 11 ; and regarding *ἐκτὸς εἰ, μὴ*, *except if*, see on xiv. 5 ; on *ἐπιστ.*, comp. iii. 5 ; Rom. xiii. 11. To refer *εἰκῇ* to *κατέχετε* (Oecumenius, Theophylact, Theodoret, Luther, Calvin, Estius, and others, including Billroth and de Wette) is impracticable for this reason, that *εἰ κατέχετε* itself is a conditional clause, while to supply such an idea as *κατέχετε δὲ πάντως* (Theophylact) would be quite an arbitrary course.

Ver. 3 f. More precise explanation of the *τίνι λόγῳ εὐηγγ. ὑμ. εἰ κατέχετε*, by adducing those main points of that *λόγος*, which are of decisive importance for the further discussion which Paul now has in view. Hofmann's interpretation of it as specifying the ground of the alleged condition and reservation in ver. 2, falls with his incorrect exposition of *εἰ κατέχετε κ.τ.λ.* — *ἐν πρώτοις*] neuter : *in primis, chiefly*, i.e. as doctrinal points of the first rank. Comp. Plato, *Pol.* p. 522 C : *ὁ καὶ παντὶ ἐν πρώτοις ἀνάγκη μαθάνειν*. To take it, with Chrysostom,¹ of the time (*ἐξ ἀρχῆς*), comp. Eccles. iv. 17, Prov. xx. 21, runs counter to the connection, according to which it is rather the fundamental *significance* of the following *doctrines* that is concerned. This in opposition also to Rückert's view of it as masculine : *to you among the first* (comp. 1 Macc. vi. 6 ; Eccles. xlv. 20 ; Thuc. vii. 19. 4 : Lucian, *Paras.* 49 ; Fritzsche, *Quaest. Luc.* p. 220), which is, moreover, historically untrue, unless with Rückert we arbitrarily supply “*in Achaia*.” — *ὁ καὶ παρέλαβον*] This conveys the idea : *which had been likewise communicated to*

¹ Who is followed by van Hengel : “*Re-censet partem eorum, a quibus proponendis Corinthios docere incepit.*” So Hofmann also in substance. According to Chrys-

ostom, Paul adduces the time as witness *καὶ ὅτι ἐσχάτης ἦν αἰσχύνης, τοσοῦτον χρόνον πεισθέντας νῦν μετατίθεσθαι*.

me,—nothing therefore new or self-invented. From *whom* Paul had received the contents of vv. 3–5, he does not say ; but for the very reason that he does not add an ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου, as in xi. 23, or words to like effect, and on account of the correlation in which παρέλαβον stands to παρέδωκα (comp. also ὁ καὶ παρελάβετε, ver. 1), as well as on account of the reference extending to the simple historical statements in ver. 5 ff., we are not to supply : *from Christ*, through *revelation* (the common view since Chrysostom), but rather : through *historical tradition*, as it was living in the church (comp. van Hengel, Ewald, Hofmann). It is true, indeed, that he has that, which forms the inner relation of the ἀπέθανεν κ.τ.λ. and belongs to the inner substance of the gospel, from revelation (Gal. i. 12) ; but here it is the *historical element* which is predominantly present to his mind. (P²) — ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτ. ἡμ.] *on account of our sins*, i.e. *in order to expiate them*, Rom. iii. 23–26 ; Gal. iii. 13 ff., *al.* The connection of the preposition with the *abstract* noun proves that Paul, in saying elsewhere ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν (comp. also Eph. v. 25 : ὑπὲρ τῆς ἐκκλησίας), has not used the preposition in the sense of *loco*, not even in 2 Cor. v. 21 ; Gal. iii. 13. The idea of the *satisfactio vicaria* lies in the thing itself, not in the preposition. See on Rom. v. 6 ; Gal. i. 4 ; Eph. v. 2. It may be added that, except in this passage, the expression ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμ. occurs nowhere in the writings of Paul (not even in Gal. i. 4), although it does in the Epistle to the Hebrews, v. 1, 3 (?), ix. 7, x. 12. Regarding the distinction between ὑπὲρ and περί the remark holds true : “id unum interest, quod περί usu frequentissimo teritur, multo rarius usurpatur ὑπὲρ,¹ quod ipsum discrimen inter Lat. praep. *de et super* locum obtinet,” Buttman, *Ind. ad Mid.* p. 188. — κατὰ τ. γραφ.] *according to the Scriptures of the O. T.* (“quae non impleri non potuere,” Bengel), in so far as these (as *e.g.* especially Isa. liii.) contain prophecies regarding the atoning death of Christ. Comp. Luke xxiv. 25 ff. ; John xx. 9, ii. 22 ; Acts xvii. 3, xxvi. 22 f., viii. 35 ; 1 Pet. i. 11. —The *second* κ. τ. γρ. does not refer to the burial (Isa. liii. 9) also, as de Wette and most interpreters assume, following Theodoret and Oecumenius, but, as is to be deduced from the repetition of the ὅτι before ἐγγγ., only to the resurrection.² See on John ii. 22. Christ's death and resurrection are the great facts of the redemptive work, borne witness to by the Scriptures ; the burial (comp. Rom. vi. 4 ; Col. ii. 12 ; Acts xiii. 29), being the consequence of the one and the presupposition of the other, lies between as an historical correlate of the corporeal reality of the resurrection, but not as a factor of the work of redemption, which as such would require to have been based *upon Scripture testimony*. — ἐγγγερται] not the aorist again ; the being risen is the abiding state, which commenced with the ἐγερθῆναι. Comp. 2 Tim. ii. 8 ; Winer, p. 255 [E. T. 339].

Ver. 5. “Res tanti momenti neque facilis creditu multis egebat testibus,” Grotius. — Κηφᾶ] Comp. Luke xxiv. 34.³ — εἰτα τοῖς δώδεκα, John xx. 19 ff. ;

¹ This holds in the N. T., where the death of Christ is spoken of, only of *those* passages in which the preposition is not joined with *persons* : of persons Paul constantly uses ὑπὲρ. Comp. on i. 13, Remark.

² And that *on the third day*, which κατὰ τ. γραφ. must be held to *include* in its reference. Comp. Matt. xii. 40 ; Luke xxiv. 46.

³ According to Holsten, *z. Ev. d. Paul. u. Petr.* p. 115 ff., the appearance made to

Luke xxiv. 36 ff. After the death of the traitor, there were indeed only *eleven* (hence several witnesses read *ένδεκα*, comp. Acts i. 26), nay, according to John *l.c.*, Thomas also was absent at that time; but comp. the official designations *decemviri*, *centumviri*, *al.*, where the proper number also was often not complete. To reckon in *Matthias* (Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Bengel, and others) would make a needless prothys-teron of the expression. It may be added that under the *ωφθη* we are always to conceive of but one act of appearing, as is especially clear from ver. 8; hence we are not in connection with *τοῖς δώδεκα* to think of a combination of John xx. 19 ff. and 26 ff. (Osiander, van Hengel, and others), to which some have even added John xxi. That Paul narrates the series of appearances *chronologically*, should not have been questioned by Wieseler (*Synopse der Evang.* p. 420 f.), who assumes only an *enumeration* of the individual cases *without order of time*. It is implied necessarily in the words of historical continuation themselves (*ἐπειτα ωφθη*), as well as in their relation to *ἐσχατον πάντων*, ver. 8. Comp. also vv. 23, 24, 46.

Ver. 6 exhibits a change in the construction—which does not continue further with *ὅτι*—but still belongs to the contents of the *παρέδωκα* and *παρέλαβον* down to *ἀποστ. πᾶσιν* (in opposition to Hofmann); for the point of view of the *ὁ καὶ παρέλαβον* reaches thus far, and it is only at ver. 8 that *personal experience* comes in instead of it. Nor is it to be inferred from the transition from the dependent to the independent construction (so frequent also, as we know, in Greek writers), which naturally corresponds with the concrete vividness of the representation, that Paul had not included this appearance and those which follow in his preaching at Corinth, but, on the contrary, was *now* communicating them to his readers as something *new* (van Hengel). Ver. 8 is especially opposed to this view, since Paul, in referring to the appearances of the Risen One, had certainly not been silent upon that made to himself (comp. ix. 1). — *ἐπάνω*] *adverbial*, not prepositional, Mark xiv. 5. Comp. *ὑπέρ*. Lobeck, *ad Phryn.* p. 410. “Some” referred to by Chrysostom, were mistaken in holding it to mean: *above*, over their heads. — *πεντακοσ.*] Consequently the number of believers in general was already much greater than that of *those who were assembled*, Acts i. 15. The remarks to the contrary by Baur and Zeller, according to whom the small number 120 is plainly shown by our passage to be incorrect, are not conclusive, since the appearance here mentioned may, without any arbitrariness, be placed at so early a stage that many pilgrims to the Passover may be conceived as still present in Jerusalem when it took place, and among these many non-Jewish disciples of Jesus, especially Galileans. The 120 who assembled afterwards were the stock of the congregation of Jerusalem itself. Comp. on Acts i. 15. On the other hand, it is possible that the Lord appeared to the 500 brethren also in *Galilee* in an assembly of so many of His disciples there (Schleiermacher, Ewald). More precise evidence is wanting. Matt. xxviii. 16 ff. has nothing to do with our passage (in oppo-

Peter also (like all the following ones) was a *vision*, the determining occasion of which

was the perplexing contradiction between the once living and the now dead Messiah.

sition to Lightfoot and Platt), but applies only to the eleven. — ἐφάπαξ] not : *once for all* (Bretschneider, comp. Rom. vi. 10 ; Heb. vii. 27, ix. 12, x. 10), but, as it is *usually* understood : *at once, simul* (Luc. Dem. enc. 21). The former sense would need to be given by the context, which, however, from the largeness of the number, naturally suggests the latter. Van Hengel, too, wrongly insists upon the meaning *semel*, holding that this appearance took place only *once*, whereas ver. 5 applies to *several* appearances. The peculiar importance of this appearance lies precisely in the *simul* (Vulgate), ἀνύποπτος δὲ τῶν τοσούτων ἡ μαρτυρία, Theodoret. This ἐφάπαξ and the multitude of the spectators exclude all the more decidedly the idea of a visionary or ecstatic seeing, although some have ascribed *all* the appearances of the Risen One to this source (see especially, Holsten, *zum Ev. des Paul. u. Petr.* p. 65 ff.). Here we should have upwards of 500 visions occurring at the same time and place, the same in substance and form, and that, too, as psychological acts of the individual minds. — οἱ πλείους] *the majority*, x. 5. Luther gives it wrongly : “many still.” — μένουσιν] *superstites sunt*. Comp. on John xxi. 22 ; Phil. i. 25. Ἐχω μάρτυρας ἔτι ζῶντας, Chrysostom. It may be added that the definite affirmation, οἱ πλείους μένουσιν, shows how earnestly the apostolic church concerned itself about the still surviving witnesses to the resurrection of Jesus, and how well it knew them.

Ver. 7. Both of these appearances also are otherwise unknown. — Ἰακώβω] The non-addition of any distinguishing epithet makes it more than probable that the person meant is he who was then the *James* κατ' ἐξοχήν, James the Just,¹ not one of the Twelve, but universally known as the *brother of the Lord* (see on ix. 4). Perhaps it was this appearance which made him become decided for the cause and service of his divine brother. Comp. Michaelis on our passage. The apocryphal narrative of the *Evang. sec. Hebr.* in Jerome, *de vir. ill.* 2, is, even as regards time, here irrelevant (in opposition to Grotius). — τοῖς ἀποστόλοις πᾶσιν] ἀπόστολοι, since it takes in James also (comp. Gal. i. 19), must stand here in a wider sense than τοῖς δώδεκα, but includes them *along with* others. In the Book of Acts, Barnabas, for instance, is called an apostle (xiv. 4, 14) ; and in 1 Thess. ii. 7, Timothy and Silvanus are comprehended under the conception ἀπόστολοι, of whom, of course, Timothy at least cannot be as yet included here. Chrysostom supposes the Seventy to be included. Comp. on xii. 28. In no case is it simply the *Twelve* again who are meant, whom Hofmann conceives to be designated here in their relation to the *church*. How arbitrary that is, and how superfluous such a designation would be ! But πᾶσι stands decidedly opposed to it ; Paul would have required to write εἶτα πάλιν τοῖς ἀποστ. Notice also the strict marking off of the original apostles by οἱ δώδεκα, an expression which Paul uses *in no other place*.

Ver. 8. Appearance at Damascus. Comp. ix. 1. — Regarding the adverbial ἔσχατον, comp. Plato, *Gorg.* p. 473 C ; Soph. *Oed. Col.* 1547 ; Mark xii. 22 (Lachm.). It concludes the *series of bodily* appearances, and thereby separates these from later appearances in visions (Acts xviii. 9), or some other

¹ Comp. Plitt in the *Zeitschrift f. Luth. Theol.* 1864, p. 23 ff.

apocalyptic way. — πάντων] is not to be understood, as has been *usually* done, of all those in general to whom Christ appeared after His resurrection, but of all *apostles*, as is the most natural interpretation from the very foregoing τοῖς ἀποστ. πασι, and is rendered certain by the τῷ ἐκτρώμ. with the article, which, according to ver. 9, denotes κατ' ἐξοχήν the apostolic “abortion.”¹—The apostle's sense of the high privilege of being counted worthy to see the Risen One awakens in him his deep humility, which was always fostered by the painful consciousness of having once persecuted the church; he therefore expresses his strong sense of unworthiness by saying that he is, as it were (ὥσπερ, *quasi*, only here in the N. T., often in classic writers), τὸ ἐκτρώμα, the *untimely foetus*, Arist. *Gener. An.* iv. 5; LXX. Num. xii. 12; Job iii. 16; Eccles. vi. 3; Aq. Ps. lvii. 9. See the passages in Wetstein, Fritzsche, *Diss.* I. p. 60 f.; and as regards the standing of the word as Greek (for which the older Attic writers have ἀμβλωμα), Lobeck, *ad Phryn.* p. 209. In opposition to Heydenreich and Schulthess (most recently in Keil and Tzschirner's *Anal.* I. 4, p. 212 f.), who interpret in a way which is linguistically erroneous (adopted, however, already by τινές in Theophylact), *late-born*, born afterwards in old age, see Fritzsche, *l.c.* The idea of being *late-born*, *i.e.* late in becoming an apostle, is conveyed in ἐσχατοῦ πάντων, not in ἐκτρώμα. What Paul meant to *indicate* in a figurative way by τ. ἐκτρ. is clearly manifest from ver. 9, *namely, that he was inferior to, and less worthy than, the rest of the apostles, in the proportion in which the abortive child stands behind that born mature.*² Comp. Bengel: “Ut abortus non est dignus humano nomine, sic apostolus negat se dignum apostoli appellatione.” See also Ignatius, *ad Rom.* 9. The distinct explanation which he gives himself in ver. 9 excludes all the other—some of them very odd—interpretations which have been given,³ along with that of Hofmann: Paul designates himself so in contrast to *those* who, when Jesus appeared to them, were brethren (James too?) or apostles, and consequently had been “*born as children of God into the life of the faith of Christ*,” whereas with him the matter had not yet come to a *full formation of Christ* (Gal. iv. 19), as was the case with the rest. This artificial interpretation is all the more erroneous, seeing that Paul, when Christ appeared to him, had not yet made even the first

¹ The “abortion” in the series of the apostles. Hofmann is wrong in making πάντων extend to the whole of the cases previously adduced. That would surely be a thing quite self-evident, namely, that in a series of cases following after each other, the last mentioned is just the *last* of all. No, πάντων is correlative to the preceding πασιν, and the progress of thought is: “to the apostles *all, last of all*, however, to me also.” Thereby Paul gives adequate expression to the deep humility with which he sees himself added to the circle of the apostles. Comp. ver. 9: ἀποστόλων, ἀπόστολος, and then the retrospective τῶν πάντων, ver. 10, also the ἐκεῖνοι, ver. 11.—Hofmann seems to take the ὥσπερ in the sense of *ut*

deceit; for he cites Klausen, *ad Aesch. Agam.* 1140, who treats specially of this meaning of the word, p. 244.

² The whole passage is entirely misunderstood by Kienlen in the *Jahrb. f. d. Theol.* 1868, p. 316 ff.

³ Among these must be placed Calvin's opinion (comp. Osiander): “Se comparat abortivo . . . subitae suae conversionis respectu,” shared by Grotius and others, including Schrader. So, too, with the view of Baronius, Estius, Cornelius à Lapide, and others, that Paul describes himself as a *supernumerary*. And Wetstein even suggests: “Pseudapostoli videntur Paulo *staturam exiguam* objecisse, 2 Cor. x. 10.”

approach to being a Christian embryo, but was the most determined opponent of the Lord, and was actively engaged in persecuting Him (Acts ix. 4); ὡσπ. τ. ἐκτρ. does not describe what Paul *was then*, when Christ appeared to him, but what he *is* since that time. — καμοί] at the end, with the unaffected stamp of humility after the expressions of self-abasement put before. — Observe further, that Paul places the appearance of the Risen One made to himself in the same series with the others, without mentioning the ascension which lay between. Certainly, therefore, he did not regard the latter as the striking, epoch-making event, which it first appears in the narrative of the Book of Acts, forty days after the resurrection. See generally on Luke xxiv. 51, Remark. But observe also what stress Paul lays here and ix. 1 upon the outwardly manifested bodily appearance of the Lord, with which Gal. i. 15 does not in any way conflict.¹ 2 Cor. xii. 2 ff. is of a different tenor.

Ver. 9. Justification of the expression ὡσπερὶ τῷ ἐκτρώματι. Vv. 9 and 10 are not a grammatical, though they may be a logical, parenthesis. — ἐγώ] has emphasis : *just I*, no other. Comp. on this confession, Eph. iii. 8 ; 1 Tim. i. 15. — ὅς οὐκ εἰμὶ κ.τ.λ.] argumentative ; *quippe qui*, etc. Comp. *Od.* ii. 41, *al.* ; Xen. *Mem.* ii. 7. 13 ; Matthiae, p. 1067, note 1. — ἱκανός] *sufficiently fitted*, Matt. iii. 11 ; Luke iii. 16 ; 2 Cor. iii. 5. — καλεῖσθαι] *to bear the name of apostle*, this high, honourable name.

Ver. 10. The other side of this humility, looking to God. *Yet has God's grace made me what I am.* Comp. Gal. i. 15. — χάριτι] has the principal emphasis, hence again ἡ χάρις αὐτοῦ. — ὃ εἰμι] In this is comprehended the whole sum of his present being and character, so different from his pre-Christian condition. — ἡ εἰς ἐμέ] Comp. 1 Pet. i. 10 : *towards me*. Plato, *Pol.* v. p. 729 D. — οὐ κενῇ] *not void of result*. Comp. ver. 58 ; Phil. ii. 16 ; 1 Thess. iii. 5. — ἐγεν.] *not : has been, but : has practically become*. — ἀλλά] introduces the great contrast to οὐ κενῇ ἐγεν., valued highly by Paul, even in the depth of his humility, as against the impugners of his apostolic position ; and introduces it with logical correctness, for περισσότερον . . . ἐκοπίασα is the result of the *grace*. — περισσ.] accusative neuter. It is the *plus of the result*. Regarding ἐκοπ. of apostolic *labour*, comp. Phil. ii. 16 ; Gal. iv. 11, *al.* — αὐτῶν πάντων] *than they all*, which may either mean : *than any of them*, or : *than they all put together*. Since the latter corresponds to the τοῖς ἀποστ. πᾶσιν, ver. 7, and suits best the design of bringing out the fruitful efficacy of the divine grace, and also agrees with history so far as known to us, it is accordingly to be preferred (Osiander and van Hengel) in opposition to the former interpretation, which is the common one. — οὐκ ἐγὼ δὲ, ἀλλ' κ.τ.λ.] Correction regarding the subject of ἐκοπίασα, *not I however, but*. Chrysostom says well : τῇ συνήθει κεχρημένος ταπεινοφροσύνη καὶ τοῦτο (that he laboured more, etc.) ταχέως παρέδραμε, καὶ τὸ πᾶν ἀνέθηκε τῷ θεῷ. Paul is conscious in himself that the relation of the efficacy of God's grace to his own personal agency is of such a kind, that what has just been stated belongs *not* to the latter, *but* to the former.² — ἡ χάρις τ. θεοῦ σὺν ἐμοί] *sc. ἐκοπίασε περισσ. αὐτ.*

¹ See Paret in the *Jahrb. f. deutsche Theol.* 1859, p. 243 ff. ; Beyschlag in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1864, p. 219 f.

² Augustine, *De Grat. et lib. arb.* 3, says : "Non ego autem, *i.e.* non solus, sed gratia Dei mecum ; ac per hoc nec gratia Dei sola,

πάντ. *Not I have laboured more, but the grace of God has done it with me* (in efficient fellowship with me, comp. Mark xvi. 20). It is to be observed that the article before σὺν ἐμοί is not genuine (see the critical remarks), and so Paul does not disclaim for himself his own self-active share in bringing about the result, but knows that the intervention of the divine grace so *outweighs* his own activity, that to the alternative, whether he or grace has wrought such great things, he can only answer, as he has done : *not I, but the grace of God with me*. Were the article before σὺν ἐμοί genuine, the thought would not be : *the grace has wrought it with me*, but : *the grace, which is with me,¹ has wrought it*. But Beza's remark holds true for the case also of the article being omitted : "Paulum ita se ipsum facere gratiae administrum, ut illi omnia tribuat." There is no ground for thinking even remotely of a "not *alone*, but *also*," or the like (see Grotius, Flatt, and others).

Ver. 11. Οὖν] takes up again the thread of the discourse which had been interrupted by vv. 9, 10, as in viii. 4, but yet with reference to ver. 9. f. — ἐκεῖνοι] *i.e.* the rest of the apostles, vv. 7, 8, 9 f. — οὕτω] so as was stated above, namely, that Christ is risen, ver. 4 ff., and see ver. 12. — καὶ οὕτως] *and in this way*, in consequence, namely, of this, that the resurrection of Jesus was proclaimed to you, ye have become believers (ἐπιστ. as in ver. 2). — Observe, further, in εἴτε οὖν ἐγὼ, εἴτε ἐκεῖνοι, the apologetic glance of apostolic self-assertion, which he turns upon those who questioned his rank as an apostle.

Ver. 12. In what a contrast, however, with this preaching stands the assertion of certain persons among you that, etc. ! Χριστός has the main emphasis in the protasis ; hence its position. — πῶς] expression of astonishment ; *how is it yet possible, that* ; xiv. 7, 16 ; Rom. iii. 6, vi. 2, viii. 32, x. 14 ; Gal. ii. 14. The logical justice of the astonishment rests on this, that the assertion, "there is no resurrection of dead persons," denies also *per consequentiam* the resurrection of Christ. Ver. 13. — τινές] *quidam, quos nominare nolo*. See Hermann, *ad Viger.* p. 731, also Schoemann, *ad Is.* p. 250. See, besides, introduction to the chapter. Ἐν ὑμῖν is simply *in your church*, without any emphasis of contradistinction to non-Christians (Krauss). — οὐκ ἔστιν] *does not take place*, there is not. Comp. Eph. vi. 9 ; Matt. xxii. 23 ; Acts xxiii. 8. Comp. also Plato, *Phaed.* p. 71 E : εἴπερ ἔστι τὸ ἀναβιώσκεισθαι, Aesch. *Eum.* 639 : ἅπαξ θανόντος οὐτις ἔστ' ἀνάστασις.

Ver. 13. Δέ] carrying onward, in order by a chain of inferences to reduce the τινές with their assertion *ad absurdum*. — οὐδέ] *even not*. The inference rests upon the principle : "*sublato genere tollitur et species*" (Grotius). For Christ had also become a νεκρός, and was, as respects His human nature, not different from other men (ver. 21). Comp. Theodoret : σῶμα γὰρ καὶ ὁ δεσπότης εἶχε Χριστός. This in opposition to the fault which Rückert finds with the conclusion, that, if Christ be a being of higher nature, the Logos of

nec ipse solus, sed gratia Dei cum illo." Therewith, however, the *relation* of the grace to the individuality, as Paul has expressed it by οὐκ ἐγὼ, ἀλλά, is entirely over-

looked.

¹ That is, which stands in helping fellowship with me. See Kühner, II. p. 276.

God, etc., the laws of created men do not hold for Him. It is plain that the resurrection, as well as the death, related only to the human form of existence. The *σῶμα* of Christ (xi. 24 ; Rom. vii. 4), the *σῶμα τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ* (Col. i. 22 ; comp. Eph. ii. 15), was put to death and rose again, which would have been impossible, if *ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν* (bodily revivification of those bodily dead) in general were a chimera. Comp. Knapp, *Ser. var. arg.* p. 316 ; Usteri, p. 364 f. ; van Hengel, p. 68 f. Calvin, following Chrysostom and Theodoret, grounds the apostle's conclusion thus : "quia enim non nisi nostra causa resurgere debuit : nulla ejus resurrectio foret, si nobis nihil prodesset." Comp. Erasmus, *Paraphr.* But according to this it would not follow from the *ἀνάστασις νεκρ.* οὐκ ἔστιν that Christ had not risen, but only that His resurrection had not fulfilled its aim. The idea, that Christ is *ἀπαρχή* of the resurrection is not yet taken for granted here (as an axiom), but comes in for the first time at ver. 20 (in opposition to Chrysostom, Theophylact, and others, including de Wette and Osiander), after the argument has already reached the result, that Christ cannot have remained in the grave, as would yet follow with logical certainty from the proposition : *ἀνάστασις νεκρ.* οὐκ ἔστιν. It is only when it comes to bring forward the *ἀπαρχή*, that the series of inferences celebrates its *victory*.

Ver. 14. Δέ] continues the series of inferences. Without the resurrection of Jesus, what are *we* with our *preaching* ! what *you* with your *faith* ! The former is then dealt with in ver. 15 f., the latter in vv. 17–19. — ἄρα] is the simple *therefore, thus (rebus ita comparatis)*. See against Hartung's view, that it introduces the *unexpected* (this may be implied in the connection, but not in the particle), Klotz, *ad Devar.* p. 160 ff. — κενόν and κενή are put first with lively emphasis. — οὐκ ἐγγύ.] i.e. *has remained in the grave*. — κενόν] *empty, i.e. without reality* (Eph. v. 6 ; Col. ii. 8), without really existing contents, inasmuch, namely, as the redemption in Christ and its completion through the Messianic *σωτηρία* are the contents of the preaching ; but this redemption has not taken place and the Messianic salvation is a chimera, if Christ has not risen. Comp. ver. 17 ; Rom. i. 4, iv. 25, viii. 34. = καί] *also*. If it holds of *Christ* that He is not risen, then it holds *also of our preaching* that it is empty. — ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν] *your faith in Jesus as the Messiah*,¹ ver. 11. Christ would, in fact, not be the Redeemer and Atoner, as which, however, He is the contents of your faith.² Comp. Simonides in Plato, *Prot.* p. 345 C : κενεὰν . . . ἐλπίδα, Soph. *Ant.* 749 : κενὰς γνώμας, Eur. *Iph. Aul.* 987, *Hel.* 36.

Ver. 15. We should not, with Lachmann, place only a comma after ver. 14 ; for ver. 15 carries independently its full confirmation with it, and its awful thought comes out all the more impressively, when taken independently of what precedes it. The emphasis of the verse lies in the God-dishonouring *ψευδομάρτυ. τοῦ θεοῦ*. In this phrase *τοῦ θεοῦ* must, in conformity with what follows, be genitivus *objecti* (not *subjecti*, as Billroth would make

¹ The reading ἡμῶν, which Olshausen prefers from a total misapprehension of the connection, has only the weak attestation of D* min. and some vss. and Fathers, and

is a mechanical repetition of the preceding ἡμῶν.

² Comp. Krauss, p. 74 ff.

if : "false witnesses, whom God has," comp. Osiander, *et al.*) : *persons who have testified what is false against God.* — κατὰ τοῦ θεοῦ] is not to be taken, with Erasmus, Beza, Wolf, Raphel, de Wette, and others, as *in respect to God, of God* (Schaefer, *ad Dem.* I. p. 412 f. ; Valck. *ad Phoen.* 821 ; Lobeck, *ad Phryn.* p. 272) ; for the context requires the reference to be as much in opposition to God as possible, and hence requires the sense : *against, adversus* (Vulgate). Comp. Matt. xxvi. 59, 62, xxvii. 13 ; Mark xiv. 56, 60, xv. 4, *al.* ; Xen. *Apol.* 13 : οὐ ψεύδομαι κατὰ τοῦ θεοῦ, Plato, *Gorg.* p. 472 B. Every *consciously false* giving of testimony that God has done something, is testimony *against* God, because an abuse of His name and injury to His holiness. — ὃν οὐκ ἤγειρεν, εἶπερ ἄρα κ.τ.λ.] *whom He has not raised, if really thus* (as is asserted) *dead persons are not raised* (Q²). Regarding εἰ ἄρα and εἶπερ ἄρα see Klotz, *l.c.* pp. 178, 528. Observe here (1) the *identity of the category*, in which Paul places the resurrection of Christ and the bodily resurrection of the dead ; (2) the *sacredness* of the apostolic testimony for the former ; (3) the *fanatical self-deception*, to which he would have been a victim, if the appearances of the Risen One had been psychological hallucinations, so that the whole transformation of Saul into Paul—nay, his whole Gospel—would rest upon this self-deception, and this self-deception upon a mental weakness which would be totally irreconcilable with his otherwise well-known strength and acuteness of intellect.

Ver. 16. Proof of the ὃν οὐκ ἤγειρεν, εἶπερ κ.τ.λ. by solemn repetition of ver. 13 entirely as to purport, and almost entirely as to the words also.

Vv. 17, 18. Solemnly now also the other conclusion from the οὐδὲ Χριστὸς ἐγήγ., already expressed in ver. 14, is once more exhibited, but in such a way that its tragical form stands out still more awfully (ματαία and ἐτι ἐστὲ ἐν τ. ἁμ. ὑμ.), and has a new startling feature added to it by reference to the lot of the departed. — ματαία] *vain, fruitless*, put first with emphasis, as ἐτι is afterwards. Comp. ver. 14. The meaning of the word *may* be the same as κενή in ver. 14 (comp. μάταιος λόγος, Plato, *Legg.* ii. p. 654 E ; Herod. iii. 56 ; μάταιος δοξασοφία, Plato, *Soph.* p. 231 B ; μάταιος ἐνχρή, Eur. *Iph. T.* 628, and the like, Isa. lix. 4 ; Eccles. xxxi. 5 ; Acts xiv. 15 ; 1 Cor. iii. 20), to which Hofmann, too, ultimately comes in substance, explaining the πίστις ματαία of their having comforted themselves groundlessly with that which has no truth. But what follows shows that *resultlessness*, the *missing of the aim*, is denoted here (comp. Tit. iii. 9 ; Plato, *Tim.* p. 40 D, *Legg.* v. p. 735 B ; Polyb. vi. 25. 6 ; 4 Macc. vi. 10). This, namely, has its character brought out in an awful manner by ἐτι ἐστὲ ἐν τ. ἁμ. ὑμ. : *then ye are still in your sins*—i.e. *then ye are not yet set free from your* (pre-Christian) *sins*, not yet delivered from the obligation of their guilt. For if Christ is not risen, then also the reconciliation with God and justification have not taken place ; without His resurrection His death would not be a *redemptive* death.¹ Rom. iv. 25, and see on ver. 14. Regarding the expression, comp. 3 Esdr. viii. 76 ; Thuc. i. 78. See also John viii. 21, 24, ix. 41. — ἄρα καὶ οἱ κοιμηθ. κ.τ.λ.] a new consequence of εἰ δὲ Χ. οὐκ ἐγήγ., but

¹ Comp. Weiss, *bibl. Theol.* p. 329.

further inferred by ἄρα from the immediately preceding ἐτι ἐστὲ ἐν ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις : *then those also who have fallen asleep are accordingly* (since they, too, can have obtained no propitiation), etc. — οἱ κοιμηθῆ.] Observe the *aorist* : *who fell asleep*, which expresses the death of the individuals as it took place at different times. It is otherwise at ver. 20 ; comp. 1 Thess. iv. 14 f. — ἐν Χριστῷ] for they died ¹ so, that they during their dying were not *out of* Christ, but through faith in Him were in living fellowship with Him. Comp. 1 Thess. iv. 16 ; Rev. xiv. 13. We are neither, with Grotius (comp. as early interpreters as Chrysostom and Theodoret), to think simply of the *martyrs* (ἐν = *propter*), nor, with Calovius, widening the historical meaning on dogmatic grounds, to include the believers of the Old Testament (even Adam), for both are without support in the context ; but to think of the *Christians deceased*. — ἀπώλοντο] *they are destroyed*, because in their death they have become liable to the state of punishment in Hades (see on Luke xvi. 23), seeing that they have, in fact, died without expiation of their sins. That this does not mean : *they have become annihilated* (Menochius, Bengel, Heydenreich, and others), is clear from ἐτι ἐστὲ ἐν τ. ἀμ. ὑμ., of which, in respect of the dead, the ἀπώλεια in Hades is the consequence.

Ver. 19. Sad lot of the Christians (not simply of the apostles, as Grotius and Rosenmüller would have it), if this οἱ κοιμηθέντες ἐν Χ. ἀπώλοντο turn out to be true ! “If we are nothing more than such, as in this *life* have their hope in Christ,—not at the same time such, as even when κοιμηθέντες will hope in Christ,²—then are we more wretched,” etc. In other words : “If the hope of the future glory (this object of the Christian hope is obvious of itself, xiii. 13 ; Rom. v. 2), which the Christian during his temporal life places in Christ, comes to nought with this life, inasmuch as death transports him into a condition through which the Christian hope proves itself to be a delusion,—namely, into the condition of ἀπώλεια,—then are we Christians more wretched,” etc.—The correct reading is εἰ ἐν τῇ ζ. ταύτῃ ἐν Χ. ἡλπ. ἐσμ. μόνον. See the critical remarks. In ἐν τ. ζωῇ ταύτῃ the main emphasis falls upon τῇ ζωῇ, as the *opposite* of κοιμηθέντες (comp. Rom. viii. 38 ; 1 Cor. iii. 22 ; Phil. i. 20 ; Luke xvi. 25), not upon ταύτῃ (so commonly) ; and μόνον belongs to the whole ἐν τ. ζ. τ. ἐν Χ. ἡλπιότες ἐσμέν, so that the adverb is put last for emphasis (Kühner, *ad Xen. Anab.* ii. 5. 14, ii. 6. 1), not simply to ἐν τ. ζ. ταύτῃ, as it is usually explained : “If we are such as *only* for *this* life (‘dum hic vivimus,’ Piscator) have placed their hope in Christ,” Billroth. This trajection of μόνον would be in the highest

¹ Κοιμᾶσθαι is the habitually used New Testament euphemism for *dying* (comp. vv. 6, 11, 30), and in no way justifies the unscriptural assumption of a sleep of the soul, in which Paul is held to have believed. See against this, Delitzsch, *Psychol.* p. 419 ff. In the euphemistic character of that expression, however, which classic writers also have (Jacobs, *ad Del. epigr.* viii. 2), lies the reason why he never uses it of the death of Christ. This was recognized as early as by

Photius, who aptly remarks, *Quaest. Amphiloeh.* 187 : ἐπὶ μὲν οὖν τοῦ Χριστοῦ θάνατον καλεῖ, ἵνα τὸ πάθος πιστώσῃται· ἐπὶ δὲ ἡμῶν κοίμησιν, ἵνα τὴν ὁδύνην παραμυθήσῃται. Ἐνθα μὲν γὰρ παρεχώρησεν ἡ ἀνάστασις, θαρρῶν καλεῖ θάνατον· ἔνθα δὲ ἐν ἐλπίσιν ἐτι μένει, κοίμησιν καλεῖ κ.τ.λ.

² The conception of the ἐλπίς does not so coincide here with that of the πίστις, as Lipsius assumes, *Rechtfertigungsl.* p. 209.

degree violent and irrational. The perfect *ἡλπικότες* indicates the continued subsistence during this life of the hope cherished ; 2 Cor. i. 10 ; 1 Tim. iv. 10, *al.* See Bernhardt, p. 378 ; Ast, *ad Plat. Legg.* p. 408. Comp. the *ἐολπᾶ* so frequent in Homer ; Duncan, *Lex.*, ed. Rost, p. 368. That the hope has an end with the present life, is not implied in the perfect (Hofmann), but in the whole statement from *εἰ* on to *μόνον*. The *participle* again with *ἐσμέν* does not stand for the *tempus finitum*, but the *predicate* is brought into peculiar relief (Kühner, II. p. 40), so that it is not said what we *do*, but what we *are* (Hoffer). Comp. as early as Erasmus, *Annot.* As regards *ἐν Χριστῷ*, comp. Eph. i. 12 ; 1 Tim. vi. 17 ; the hope is *in Christo reposita*, rests in Christ. Comp. *πιστεύειν ἐν* ; see on Gal. iii. 26. Rückert is wrong in connecting *ἐν Χ.* with *μόνον* (equivalent to *ἐν μόνῳ τῷ Χ.*) : “If we in the course of this life have placed our whole confidence *on Christ alone*, have (at the end of our life) disdained every other ground of hope and despised every other source of happiness, and yet Christ is not risen . . . is able to perform nothing of what was promised ; then are we the most unhappy,” etc. Against this may be decisively urged both the position of *μόνον* and the wholly arbitrary way in which the conditioning main idea is supplied (“and if yet Christ is not risen”). According to Baur, what is meant to be said is : “if the whole contents of our life were the mere hoping,” which, namely, never passes into fulfilment. But in that way a pregnancy of meaning is made to underlie the *ἡλπικότες*, which must have been at least indicated by the arrangement : *εἰ ἡλπικότες μόνον ἐσμέν κ.τ.λ.* — *ἐλεεινότεροι πάντ.*] *more worthy of compassion than all men*, namely, who are in existence besides us Christians. Comp. the passages in Wetstein. Regarding the form *ἐλεεινός*, which is current with Plato also (in opposition to Ast) and others, instead of *ἐλεινός*, see Lobeck, *ad Phryn.* p. 87 ; Bornemann, *ad Xen. Anab.* iv. 4. 11, Lips. *In how far* the Christians—supposing them to be nothing more than persons who build their hope upon Christ so long as they *live*, who therefore after their death will see the hope of their life concerning the future *δόξα* vanish away—are the most wretched of all men, is clear of itself from their distinctive position, inasmuch, namely, as for the sake of what is hoped for they take upon themselves privation, self-denial, suffering, and distresses (Rom. viii. 18 ; 2 Cor. iv. 17 f. ; Col. iii. 3), and then in death notwithstanding fall a prey to the *ἀπώλεια*. In this connection of the condition *until* death with the disappointment *after* death would lie the *ἐλεεινόν*, the tragic nothingness of the Christian moral eudaemonism, which sees in Christ its historical basis and divine warrant. The unbelieving, on the contrary, live on carelessly and in the enjoyment of the moment. Comp. ver. 32, and see Calvin's exposition. (R²)

Ver. 20. No, we Christians are not in this unhappy condition ; Christ is risen, *καὶ τὴν τοῦ ἡμετέρου σωτῆρος ἀνάστασιν ἐχέγγυνον* (guarantee) *τῆς ἡμετέρας ἐχομεν ἀναστάσεως*, Theodoret. Several interpreters (Flatt, comp. Calvin on ver. 29) have wrongly regarded vv. 20–28 as an episode. See on ver. 29. — *νυνὶ δὲ*] *jam vero, but now, as the case really stands.* Comp. xiii. 13, xiv. 6, *al.* — *ἀπαρχὴ τῶν κεκοιμ.*] *as first-fruits of those who have fallen asleep*, predicative more precise definition to *Χριστός*, *inasmuch* as He is risen from the

dead. Comp. as regards ἀπαρχή used of *persons*, xvi. 15 ; Rom. xvi. 5 ; Jas. i. 18 ; Plutarch, *Thes.* 16. The meaning is : “ Christ is risen, so that thereby He has made the holy beginning of the general resurrection of those who have fallen asleep ” (comp. ver. 23 ; Col. i. 18 ; Rev. i. 5 ; Clement, Cor. I. 24). Whether in connection with ἀπαρχή Paul was thinking precisely of a *definite* offering of first-fruits as the concrete foil to his conception (comp. Rom. xi. 16), in particular of the sheaves of the Paschal feast, Lev. xxiii. 10 (Bengel, Osiander, and others), must, since he indicates nothing more minutely, remain undecided. The genitive is *partitive*. See on Rom. viii. 23. — That by τῶν κεκοιμ. we are to understand *believers*, is to be inferred both from the word itself, which in the New Testament is always used only of the death of the saints, and also from the fellowship with Christ denoted by ἀπαρχή. And in truth what is conceived of is the *totality* of departed believers, including, therefore, those too who shall still fall asleep up to the Parousia, and then belong also to the κεκοιμήμενοι (the sleeping ; see ver. 23. This does not exclude the fact that Christ is the raiser of the dead also for the *unbelieving* ; He is not, however, *their* ἀπαρχή ; but see on ver. 22. That those, moreover, who were raised before Christ and by Christ Himself (as Lazarus), also those raised by apostles, do not make the ἀπαρχή τῶν κεκοιμ. untrue, is clear from the consideration that no one previously was raised to immortal life (to ἀφθαρσία) ; while Enoch and Elias (Gen. v. 24 ; 2 Kings ii. 11) did not die at all. Christ thus remains πρῶτος ἐξ ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν, Acts xxvi. 23. But the ἀπαρχή allows us to look from the *dawn* of the eschatological order of salvation, as having taken place already, to the certainty of its future completion. Luthardt says well : “ The risen Christ is the beginning of the history of the end.”

Ver. 21. Assigning the ground for the characteristic ἀπαρχή τῶν κεκοιμ. “ For *since* (seeing that indeed, i. 21 f., xiv. 16 ; Phil. ii. 26) *through a man death is brought about, so also through a man is resurrection of the dead brought about.* ” We must supply simply ἐστὶ ; but the conclusion is not (Calvin and many others) *e contrariis causis ad contrarios effectus*, but, as is shown by the δι’ ἀνθρώπου twice prefixed with emphasis : *a causa mali effectus ad similem causam contrarii effectus*. The evil which arose through a human author is by divine arrangement removed also through a human author. *How* these different effects are each brought about by a man, Paul assumes to be known to his readers from the instructions which he must have given them orally, but reminds them thereof by ver. 22. — θάνατος] of *physical* death, Rom. v. 12. — ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν] *resurrection of dead persons*, abstractly expressed, designates the matter ideally and in general. So also θάνατος without the article ; see the critical remarks.

Ver. 22. More precise explanation confirmatory of ver. 21, so that the first δι’ ἀνθρώπου is defined *in concreto* by ἐν τῷ Ἀδάμ, likewise θάνατος by πάντες ἀποθνήσκουσιν κ.τ.λ. — ἐν τῷ Ἀδάμ] *In Adam it is causally established that all die*, inasmuch as, namely, through Adam’s sin death has penetrated to all, Rom. v. 12 ; to which statement only Christ Himself, who, as the sinless One, submitted Himself to death in free obedience toward the Father

(Phil. ii. 8 ; Rom. v. 19), forms a self-evident exception. — ἐν τῷ Χ.] for *in Christ* lies the ground and cause, why at the final historical completion of His redemptive work the death which has come through Adam upon all shall be removed again, and all shall be made alive through the resurrection of the dead. In this way, therefore, certainly no one shall be made alive except in Christ,¹ but this will happen to *all*. Since πάντες, namely, is not to be restricted to the totality of *believers*, but to be taken quite *generally* (see below), there thus results more specially as the idea of the apostle : Christ, when He appears in His glory, is not simply the giver of life for His believing people ; He makes them (through the resurrection, and relatively through the transformation, ver. 51) alive unto the eternal Messianic ζωή (Rom. viii. 11 ; but His life-giving power extends also to the other side, that is, to the unbelievers who must experience the necessary opposite of the completed redemption ; these He awakes to the resurrection of condemnation. Paul thus agrees with John v. 28 f. ; Matt. x. 28 ; and thus his declaration recorded in Acts xxiv. 15 finds its confirmation in our text (comp. on Phil. iii. 11). — πάντες ζωοπ.] which is to be understood not of the new principle of life introduced into the consciousness of humanity (Baur, *neut. Theol.* p. 198), but, according to the context and on account of the future, in the eschatological sense, is by most interpreters (including Flatt, Billroth, Rückert, Osiander, van Hengel, Maier, Ewald, Hofmann, Lechler, *apost. Zeit.* p. 145 ; Lutterbeck, II. p. 232 ff.) held to refer only to *believers*. But ἕκαστος, ver. 23, requires us to think of the resurrection of *all* (so also Olshausen, de Wette) ; for otherwise we should have to seek the πάντες collectively in the second class ἐπειτα οἱ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, so that οἱ τοῦ Χριστοῦ and the πάντες would cover each other, and there could be no mention at all of an ἕκαστος ἐν τῷ ἰδίῳ τάγματι in reference to the πάντες. Accordingly we must not restrict ζωοπ. to *blessed* life, and perhaps explain (so de Wette, comp. also Neander *in loc.* ; Messner, *Lehre der Apost.* p. 291 f. ; Strohm, *Christus d. Erstl. d. Entschlaf.* 1866) its universality (πάντες) from the (not sanctioned by the N. T.) ἀποκατάστασις πάντων (comp. Weizel in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1836, p. 978 ; Kern in the *Tüb. Zeitschr.* 1840, 3, p. 24). Neither must we so change the literal meaning, as to understand it only of the *destination*² of all to the blessed resurrection (J. Müller in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1835, p. 751), or as even to add mentally the *condition* which holds universally for the partaking in salvation (Hofmann)—which alteration of what is said categorically into a hypothetical statement is sheer arbitrariness. On the contrary, ζωοποιηθ. (see also ver. 36), confronted with the quite universal assertion of the opponents that a resurrection of the dead is a *non ens* (vv. 12–16), is in and by itself *indifferent* (comp. Rom. iv. 17 ; 2 Kings v. 7 ; Neh. ix. 6 ; Theod. Isa. xxvi. 14 ; Lucian, *V. H.* i. 22), the abstract opposite of θάνατος (comp. ver. 36), in connection with which the concrete difference as regards the different subjects is left for the reader himself to infer. As early interpreters as Chrysostom, Ambrosiaster, and Theodoret

¹ Von Zezschwitz in the *Erlang. Zeitschr.* 1863, Apr. p. 197. Comp. also Luthardt, *v. d. letzten Dingen*, p. 125.

² Comp. Krauss, p. 107 ff., who finds in the whole chain of thought the ἀποκατάστασις τῶν πάντων.

have rightly understood πάντες ζωοπ. not simply of the blessed resurrection, but generally of *bodily* revivification, and without limiting or attaching conditions to the πάντες. It denotes all without exception, as is necessary from ver. 23, and in keeping with the quite universal πάντες of the first half of the verse. See, too, on ver. 24. In opposition to the error regarding the Apokatastasis, see generally Philippi, *Glaubenslehre*, III. p. 372 ff.; Martensen, *Dogmat.* § 286. (s²)

Ver. 23. *Each, however, in his own division, sc. ζωοποιηθήσεται.* — τάγμα] does not mean *order of succession*, but is a military word (*division of the army, legion*, Xen. *Mem.* iii. 1. 11, and see the passages in Wetstein and Schweighäuser, *Lex. Polyb.* p. 610 f.), so that Paul presents the different divisions of those that rise under the image of different troops of an army. In Clement also, *Cor.* i. 37, 41, this meaning should be retained. — ἀπαρχὴ Χριστός] as *first-fruits Christ*, namely, *vivificatus est*. What will ensue in connection with the ἀπαρχή, after the lapse of the period between it and the Parousia, belongs to the future. It would appear, therefore, as though ἀπαρχὴ Χ. were not pertinent here, where the design is to exhibit the order of the *future* resurrection (ver. 22). But Paul regards the resurrection of all, *including Christ Himself*, as *one* great connected process, only taking place in several acts, so that thus by far the greater part indeed belongs to the future, but, in order not simply to the *completeness* of the whole, but at the same time *for the sure guarantee* of what was to come, the ἀπαρχή also may not be left unmentioned. There is no ground for importing any further special design; in particular, Paul cannot have intended to counteract such conceptions, as that the whole τάγμα must forthwith be made alive along with its leader (von Zezschwitz), or to explain why those who have fallen asleep in Christ continue in death and do not arise immediately (Hofmann). For no reader could expect the actual resurrection of the dead *before the Parousia*; that was the *postulate* of the Christian hope.¹—We may note that, in using ἀπαρχή, Paul departs again from his military mode of conception as expressed in τάγμα; otherwise he would have written ἀρχός, ἀρχηγός, ἐπαρχος, κορυφαῖος, or something similar. — οἱ τοῦ Χριστοῦ] *the Christians*, Gal. v. 24; 1 Thess. iv. 16. — ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ αὐτοῦ] *at His coming* to set up the Messianic kingdom, Matt. xxiv. 3; 1 Thess. ii. 19, iii. 13, iv. 15; Jas. v. 7 f.; 1 John ii. 28; 2 Pet. iii. 4. Paul accordingly describes the τάγμα which rises first after Christ Himself (as the ἀπαρχή) thus: thereafter shall *the confessors of Christ* be raised up *at His Parousia*. It is opposed to this—the only correct—meaning of the words to restrict οἱ τοῦ Χριστοῦ to the *true Christians* (οἱ πιστοὶ καὶ οἱ εὐδοκμηκότες, Chrysostom), and thereby to anticipate the *judgment* (2 Cor. v. 10; Rom. xiv. 10), or to include along with them the *godly of the Old Testament*, as Theodoret, and of late Maier, have done. Not less contrary to the words is it to explain away the *Parousia*, as van Hengel does: “qui sectatores Christi fuerunt, *quum ille hac in terra erat.*” This is grammatically incorrect, for the *article* would have needed to be repeated;² in-

¹ This applies also against the view of Weiss, *bibl. Theol.* p. 429, that Paul wishes to anticipate the question, Why, then, has

no other of them that sleep arisen, seeing that Christ has truly arisen already?

² Because ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ αὐτοῦ does not

appropriate as regards expression, for ἡ παρουσία τοῦ Χ. is in the whole New Testament the habitual technical designation of the *last* coming of Christ ; and lastly, missing the mark as to meaning, since it would yield only a non-essential, accidental *difference as to the time of discipleship* as the criterion of distinction (Matt. xx. 16). (T²) — ἐπειτα is simply *thereafter, thereupon*, looking back to the ἀπαρχή, not *following next*, as Hofman would have it. The *intervening period* is the time running on to the Parousia. Hofmann inappropriately compares the use of the word in Soph. *Ant.* 611, where τὸ ἐπειτα occurs and denotes what follows *immediately* next ; see Schneidewiin on Soph. *l.c.* ; also Hermann *in loc.* : “a quo proximum est cum eoque cohaeret.”

Ver. 24. Εἴτα τὸ τέλος] *sc.* ἔσται. *Then shall the end be*, namely, as is clear from the whole context, *the end of the resurrection*. Bengel puts it aptly : “correlatum *primitiarum*” (comp. Matt. xxiv. 14, where τὸ τέλος is correlative with ἀρχή in ver. 8, also Mark xiii. 7, 9) ; although Christ is only the *first-fruits* of the *believers*, He is nevertheless at the same time the beginning of *all*. According to Paul, therefore, the order of the resurrection is this : (1) it has begun already with *Christ Himself* ; (2) at Christ's return to establish His kingdom the *Christians* shall be raised up ; (3) thereafter—how soon, however, or how long after the Parousia, is not said¹—sets in *the last act of the resurrection*, its *close*, which, as is now self-evident after what has gone before, applies to the *non-Christians*.² These too shall, it is plain, be *judged* (vi. 2, xi. 32), of which their *resurrection* is the necessary premiss (in opposition to Weiss, *bibl. Theol.* p. 430 f.). Paul has thus conjoined the doctrine of *Judaism* regarding a twofold resurrection (Bertholdt, *Christol.* pp. 176 ff., 203 ff.) with the *Christian* faith, in accordance with the example of Christ Himself (see on Luke xiv. 14 ; John v. 29). The *majority* of interpreters after Chrysostom (including Reiche, Ewald, Maier) understand τὸ τέλος of the *end of the present age of the world*,³ the *final consummation* (Weiss), the *closing issue of things* (Luthardt, *v. d. letzten Dingen*, p. 127), which includes also the resurrection of all men. (U²) In connection with this Rückert thinks (comp. Kling, p. 505) that εἴτα indicates the *immediate* following, one upon the other, of the ἀνάστασις and the τέλος ; Ols-hausen, again, that Paul conceived the thousand years of the Messianic kingdom to come in between the Parousia, and the τέλος, and the resurrection of the non-Christians to be joined together with the τέλος. But against the latter view it may be urged that, according to the constant doctrine of

blend together with οἱ τοῦ Χ. into a unity of conception ; as, for example, τοῖς πλου-σίοις ἐν τῷ νῦν αἰῶνι, 1 Tim. vi. 17, where τοῖς πλουσ. receives an essential *modification of the conception* by the note of time added.

¹ Within this intermediate time falls the continued conquest of Christ over all hostile powers, vv. 24, 25, whose subjugation will not yet be completed at the Parousia. This also in opposition to Weiss, *bibl. Theol.* p. 427. To import into this period a process of redemption for the non-Christians and the wicked (Weizel, Stroh), is neither in ac-

cord with Paul nor with the New Testament generally.

² Van Hengel, too, takes it rightly of the closing act of the resurrection, but explains this in consequence of his incorrect understanding of οἱ τοῦ Χ. ἐν τῇ παρουσ. αὐτοῦ : “tum *ceteri Christi sectatores*, qui mortem subierant, in vitam restituentur.”

³ Comp. Calvin : “*finis, i.e. meta cursus nostri*, quietus portus, conditio nullis amplius mutationibus obnoxia.” Erasmus, *Paraphr.* : “*finis humanarum vicissitudinum.*”

the New Testament (apart from Rev. xx.), *with* the Parousia there sets in the *finis hujus saeculi*, so that the Parousia itself is the terminal point of the pre-Messianic, and the commencing-point of the future, world-period (Matt. xxiv. 3, *al.*; Usteri, *Lehrbegr.* p. 344). Against the former view it may be decisively urged, that εἶτα τὸ τέλος in the *assumed* sense would be inappropriate here, where the order of the resurrection is stated and is begun with ἀπαρχή; further, that Paul would not have given, in any proper sense at all, the promised order of succession, whether we take πάντες, ver. 22, simply of *believers* or correctly of *all in general*. For in the former case there could be no mention at all of several τάγματα (see on ver. 22); and in the latter case Paul would have passed over in silence the very greatest τάγμα of all, that of those who died non-Christians. But how complete and self-consistent everything is, if ἀπαρχή is the beginning, ἔπειτα οἱ τοῦ Χριστοῦ the second act, and εἶτα τὸ τέλος the last act *of the same transaction*! So in substance among the old interpreters, Theodoret and Occumenius, later Cajetanus, Bengel, Jehne, *de resurrect. carn.* Alton. 1788, p. 19; Heydenreich, Osiander, Grimm in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1850, p. 784. In accordance with what has been said, we must reject also the view of Grotius and Billroth, that τὸ τέλος is *the end of the kingdom of Christ* (comp. Kahnis, *Dogm.* I. p. 575); in connection with which Billroth leaves it undecided whether Paul conceived that there would be a thousand years' reign, but finds rightly that his conception is different from that of Rev. xx. 1 ff.¹ The same considerations militate against this view as against that of Rückert; moreover, τέλος requires its explanation not from what follows, but from what precedes it, with which it stands in the closest relation. This also in opposition to de Wette (so, too, Lechler, *apost. u. nachapost. Zeitalter*, p. 140; Neander *in loc.*), who understands the completion of *the eschatological events* (comp. Beza), so that the general resurrection would be *included* in the conception (comp. Theophylact: τὸ τέλος τῶν πάντων καὶ αὐτῆς τῆς ἀναστάσεως); similarly, therefore, as regards the latter point, with Luthardt and Olshausen. Theodoret is right, in accordance with the Pauline type of doctrine (comp. Matt. xiii. 39 f.), in remarking already at the *preceding* class (οἱ τοῦ Χ.): κατὰ τὸν τῆς συντελείας καιρόν. For the intervening period between the ἔπειτα and the εἶτα is by no means to be reckoned to the αἰὼν οὗτος, but to the αἰὼν μέλλων, of which it is the first stage in time and development; the absolute consummation is then the giving over of the kingdom, which is immediately preceded by the last act of the resurrec-

¹ According to the Apocalypse, between the first and second resurrection there is the thousand years' reign, which ends with Satan's being again let loose and again overcome and cast into hell. Olshausen, who does not admit the variation of the Pauline doctrine from the Apocalyptic, holds that the Revelation, which handles the doctrine *ex professo*, is only more detailed. But this plea would only avail if Paul had shown himself to be a Chiliast somewhere else. This, however, he has never done, often as

he had opportunity for doing so. In substance like Olshausen's is the view of de Wette and of Georgii in Zeller's *Jahrb.* 1845, 1, p. 14, who, however, put this difference between Paul and the author of the Apocalypse, that the former leaves the *duration* of the reign indefinite, and places the Messiah's conflict not at the end of this regnal period, but throughout the *whole time of its duration*. But these differences are so essential, that they would do away with the agreement of the two.

tion (τὸ τέλος). Hofmann (comp. also his *Schriftbew.* II. 2, p. 657) takes το τέλος *adverbially*, and then the two clauses commencing with ὅταν as protases to ἔσχατος, ἐχθρὸς καταργ. ὁ θάνατος, ver. 26, so that in this way δεῖ γὰρ αὐτὸν κ.τ.λ., ver. 25, falls to the second of those two protases as a reason assigned, inserted between it and the apodosis; consequently: *then shall finally, when . . ., when . . ., the last enemy be brought to nought.* This bringing to nought of death, he holds, includes the raising to life of such as, being ordained to life, did not belong to Christ during their bodily existence, and thus there is formed of these a second τάγμα, for the possibility of which Hofmann adduces Rom. ii. 15 f. But in what an involved and violent way are the simple, clear, and logically flowing sentences of the apostle thus folded and fenced in, and all for the purpose of getting out of them at last a second τάγμα, which, however, does not stand there at all, but is only inserted between the lines; and that, too, such a τάγμα as is entirely alien to the New Testament eschatology, and least of all can be established by Rom. ii. 15 f. (see *in loc.*) as even barely possible! And how unsuitable it is to treat ver. 25, although introduced with solemn words of Scripture, as a subordinate sentence of confirmation, making the chain of protases on to the final short principal sentence only the longer and clumsier! In this whole section withal Paul employs only sentences of short and simple construction, without any involved periods. It may be added that, from a linguistic point of view, there would be nothing to object against the adverbial interpretation of τὸ τέλος, considered solely in itself (comp. 1 Pet. iii. 8); but, after the two elements which have gone before, the substantive explanation is the only one which presents itself as accordant with the context; nay, the adverbial use would have here, as the whole exegetical history of the passage shows, only led the understanding astray. — ὅταν παραδιδῶ κ.τ.λ.] states with what τὸ τέλος will be contemporaneous: *when he gives over the (Messianic) kingdom, etc.* The church, or the fellowship of believers (van Hengel), is never designated by ἡ βασιλ., not even vi. 9 f.; Eph. v. 5; Col. i. 13, iv. 11; neither is it so here. The conception, on the contrary, is: the last act of Christ's Messianic rule consists in the close of the resurrection, namely, the raising up of the non-Christians;¹ this He performs when He is about to hand over the rule to God, after which the last-named wields the government Himself and immediately, and Christ's Messianic, and in particular His kingly office—the regency which had been entrusted to Him by God (Phil. ii. 9 f.)—is accomplished. It was a purely dogmatic (anti-Arian) explaining away of the clear meaning of the word to take παραδιδόναι as equivalent to κατορθοῦν (Chrysostom) or τελειοῦν (Theophylact); such, too, was the interpretation of Theodoret, Ambrosiaster, Cajetan, Estius, and others, including Storr and Flatt, according to which the giving over of the kingdom to the Father denotes the producing the result, that God shall be universally *acknowledged* as the supreme Ruler, even by those who did not wish to acknowledge Him as such.

¹ With which their judgment is necessarily bound up; but an express mention of the

latter as included was not called for by the connection of the passage.

Hilary and Augustine (*de Trin.* i. 8) have another mode of explaining it away : what is meant is the bringing of the elect to the vision of God ; similarly van Hengel (comp. Neander) : Paul means to say, “*Christum sectatores suos facturum peculium Dei, ut ei vivant ;*” and in like manner Beza, Heydenreich : we are to understand it of the *presentation of the citizens of the kingdom, raised from the dead, before God*. Another mode is that of Calovius, Bengel, Osiander, Reiche, *al.* (comp. also Gess, *Pers. Chr.* p. 280) : it is only the *form* of the rule of Christ (namely, as the *reconciler*) that ceases then ; the *regnum gratiae* ceases, and the *regnum gloriae* follows, which is what Luther’s and Melanchthon’s exposition¹ also comes to in substance. No ; Christ, although by His exaltation to the right hand of the Father He has become the *σύνθρονος* of God, is still only He who is invested with the sovereignty by the Father until all hostile powers are overcome (comp. Phil. ii. 9 ff. ; Eph. i. 21 ; Acts ii. 33 ff. ; Heb. i. 3, 13),² so that the absolute supreme sovereignty, which remains with the Father, is again immediately exercised after that end has been attained ; the work of Christ is then completed ; He gives up to the Father the Messianic administration of the kingdom, which has continued since His ascension.³ The thought is similar in Pirke Elies. 11. “*Nonus rex est Messias, qui reget ab extremitate una mundi ad alteram. Decimus Deus S. B. ; tunc redibit regnum ad auctorem suum.*” We must not mix up the spiritual βασιλεία, John xviii. 37, here, where the subject is the exalted Lord. — τῷ θεῷ κ. πατρί] *God, who is at the same time Father, namely, of Jesus Christ*. Comp. Rom. xv. 6 ; 2 Cor. i. 3, xi. 31 ; Gal. i. 3 ; Eph. i. 3, v. 20 ; Col. i. 3 ; 1 Pet. i. 3 ; Jas. i. 27, iii. 9. Estius says rightly : “*unus articulus utrumque complectens.*” See Matthiae, p. 714 f., and on Rom. xv. 6. That Paul, however, means by πατὴρ Χριστοῦ, not the supernatural bodily generation, but the metaphysical spiritual derivation, according to which Christ is κατὰ πνεῦμα ἁγιοσύνης the Son of God, see on Rom. i. 4.—But this giving over of the kingdom will not take place sooner than : ὅταν καταργήσῃ κ.τ.λ., *when He shall have done away, etc.* Observe the difference of meaning between ὅταν with the *present* (παράδιδῃ) and with the *aurist* (*futur. exact.*). See Matthiae, p. 1195. And this difference of tense shows of itself that of the two clauses introduced with ὅταν, this second one is *subordinated* to the first, and not *co-ordinated* with it (Hofmann). Hence, too, we have no καί or τε with the second ὅταν. It is the familiar phenomenon of the double protasis, the one being dependent on the other (Kühner, *ad Xen. Mem.* i. 2. 35 ; *Anab.* iii. 2. 31). — πᾶσαν ἀρχὴν . . . δύναμιν.] *every dominion and every power and might*, is to be understood, as ver. 25 proves clearly, of *all hostile powers*, of all influences *opposed to God*, whose might Christ will bring to nought

¹ Luther : Christ is now ruling through the word, not in visible public fashion, as we see the sun through a cloud. “*There we see indeed the light, but not the sun itself ; but when the clouds are gone, then we see both light and sun together in one and the same subsistence.*” Melanchthon : “*Offeret regnum patri, i.e. ostendet has actiones (namely, of*

the mediatorial office), *completas esse, et deinde simul regnabit ut Deus, immediate divinitatem nobis ostendens.*”

² Comp. upon the relation of the dominion of Christ, as conferred by the supreme Sovereign, the parable in Luke xix. 12 ff.

³ Comp. von Zezschwitz, *l.c.* p. 208 ; Luthardt, *l.c.* p. 128.

(καταργ., comp. ii. 6); consequently we may not explain it *simply* of demoniac powers (Chrysostom, Calovius, and others, including Heydenreich, Billroth, Usteri, Neander, Luthardt), nor refer it to *worldly political powers* as such (Grotius). In opposition to the context on account of τοὺς ἐχθρούς, ver. 25, Calvin interprets it (comp. Cajetanus): “potestates *legitimas a Deo ordinatas*; and Olshausen understands all rule, *good as well as bad, and even that of the Son also*, to be meant. The *subject* of καταργ. must, it may be added, be the same with that of παραδιδῶ, consequently not *God* (Beza, Grotius, Bengel, Heydenreich, van Hengel, and others).

Vv. 25–28. Establishment of the fact that Christ will not deliver up the kingdom until after the doing away of every dominion, etc. (vv. 25–27, down to πόδας αὐτοῦ), but that then this abdication will assuredly follow (vv. 27–28).—*For He must* (it is necessary in accordance with the divine counsel) *reign* (wield the Messianic government) *until*, etc. The emphasis of the sentence as it advances falls on this *until*, etc.—ἄχρις οὗ κ.τ.λ.] words taken from Ps. cx. 1,—a Messianic psalm, according to Christ Himself (Matt. xxii. 43 f.),—which Paul does not quote, but appropriates for himself. The *subject* to θῆ is not *God* (so even Hofmann), but *Christ* (so Rückert, de Wette, Osiander, Neander, Ewald, Maier, comp. already Chrysostom), which is necessarily required by the preceding αὐτόν, and by καταργήσῃ in ver. 24, to which θῆ κ.τ.λ. corresponds.¹ Not till ver. 27 does *God* come in as the subject without violence and in harmony with the context.—ἄχρις οὗ indicates the *terminus ad quem* of the dominion of Christ, *after* which epoch this dominion will have ceased; see on ver. 24. The strange shifts which have been resorted to in order to maintain here the subsequent continuance of the rule of Christ (οὗ τῆς βασιλείας οὐκ ἔσται τέλος was added to the Nicene Creed in opposition to Marcellus in the second Oecumenical Council), may be seen in Estius and Flatt. His *kingdom* continues, but not His *regency*, ver. 24. The seeming contradiction to Luke i. 33 (Dan. vii. 14) is got rid of by the consideration that the government of Christ lasts on into the αἰὼν μέλλων, and that after its being given over to the Father, the kingdom itself will have its highest and eternal completion (ver. 28); thus that prophecy receives its eschatological fulfilment. (v²)

Ver. 26. More precise definition of the ἄχρις οὗ by specification of the enemy who is *last of all* to be brought to nought. As *last enemy* (whose removal is dealt with after all the others, so that then none is left remaining) *is death done away* (by Christ), (w²) inasmuch, namely, as after completion of the raising of the dead (of the non-Christians also, see on ver. 22) the might of death shall be taken away, and now there occurs no more any state of death, or any dying. The *present* sets it before us as realized. Olshausen imports arbitrarily the idea that in ἔσχατος there lies a reference not simply to the *time* of the victory, but also to the *greatness of the resistance*. To understand *Satan* (Heb. ii. 14) to be meant by θάνατος, with Usteri, *Lehrbegr.* p. 373, and others, following Pelagius, is without warrant

¹ We are not, however, on this account to write πόδας αὐτοῦ instead of π. αὐτοῦ; the

pronoun has proceeded from the standpoint of the writer.

from linguistic usage, and without ground from the context. As regards the *personification* of the death, which is done away, comp. Rev. xx. 14 ; Isa. xxv. 8.¹

Ver. 27. Πάντα γὰρ . . . αὐτοῦ] Proof that death also must be done away. This enemy cannot remain in existence, for otherwise God would not have *all things*, etc. The point of the proof lies in πάντα, as in Heb. ii. 8.—The words are those of Ps. viii. 7, which, as familiar to the reader (comp. on Rom. ix. 7 ; Gal. iii. 11), Paul makes his own, and in which he, laying out of account their historical sense, which refers to the rule of man over the earth, recognizes, as is clear from ὅταν δὲ εἶπῃ κ.τ.λ., a typical declaration of God, which has its antitypical fulfilment in the completed rule of the Messiah (the δεύτερος ἄνθρωπος, ver. 47). Comp. Eph. i. 22 ; Heb. ii. 8.—The *subject* of ὑπέταξε (which expresses the subjection *ordained* by God *in the word of God*) is *God*, as was obvious of itself to the reader from the familiar passage of the psalm. If God has in that passage of Ps. viii. subjected *all* to the might of Christ, then death also must be subdued by Him; otherwise it is plain that one power would be excepted from that divine subjection of all things to Christ, and the πάντα would not be warranted.—ὅταν δὲ εἶπῃ κ.τ.λ.] δέ leading on, namely, to the confirmation of the giving over of the kingdom to God, for which proof is still to be adduced: “but, when He shall have said that the whole is subjected, then without doubt He will be excepted from this state of subjection, who has subjected the whole to Him.” The *subject* of εἶπῃ is not ἡ γραφή (de Wette, *al.*), but neither is it *Christ* (Hofmann), but the same as of ὑπέταξεν, therefore *God*, whose word that passage of the psalm adduced is not as regards its historical connection, but is so simply as a *word of Scripture*. Comp. on vi. 16. The *aorist* εἶπῃ is to be taken regularly, not, with Luther and the majority of interpreters: when He *says*, but, like vv. 24, 28, as *futurum exactum*: *dixerit* (Irenaeus, Hilary). So, too, Hofmann rightly.² Comp. Luke vi. 26. Plato, *Parm.* p. 143 C; *Ion.* p. 535 B; also ἐὰν εἶπῃ, x. 28, xii. 15. The point of time of the *quando*, ὅταν, is that at which the now still unexecuted πάντα ὑπέταξεν shall be executed and completed; hence, also, not again the *aorist*, but the *perfect* ὑποτέτακται. The progress of the thought is therefore: “But when God, who in Ps. viii. 7 has ordained the ὑπόταξις, shall have once uttered the declaration, that it be *accomplished*—this ὑπόταξις.” This *form* of presenting it was laid to the apostle’s hand by the fact that he had just expressed himself in the words of a *saying of Scripture* (a saying of God). In Heb. i. 6 also the *aorist* is not to be understood as a present, but (πάλιν) as a *futurum exactum*. See Lünemann *in loc.* — δῆλον ὅτι] Adverbial,

¹ [The meaning of this verse, here correctly given, does not seem to me to be expressed in the A. V. or in the revision of 1881.—T. W. C.]

² Who, however, with his reference of εἶπῃ to Christ as its subject gains the conception: “As Christ at the end of His obedience on earth said: τετέλεσται, so shall He at the end of His reign within the world

say: πάντα ὑποτέτακται.” But with what difficulty could a reader light upon the analogy of that τετέλεσται! How naturally, on the contrary, would he be led to think of the subject of ὑπέταξεν, consequently *God*, as the speaker also in εἶπῃ! This applies also in opposition to Luthardt, *l.c.* p. 131.

in the sense of *manifestly, assuredly*; therefore: *it* (namely, the πάντα ὑποτέτακται) *will clearly take place with the exception of Him, who, etc.* See regarding this use of δῆλον ὅτι, which has to be analyzed by means of supplying the preceding predicate, Matthiae, p. 1494; Sturz, *Lex. Xen.* I. p. 661 f.; Buttman, *ad Plat. Crit.* p. 53 A (p. 106). According to Hofmann, δῆλον ὅτι is meant as, *namely*, as it is used likewise in Greek writers, and especially often in grammarians (not Gal. iii. 11); from δῆλον to πάντα is only an explanation interposed, after which the former ὅταν δὲ εἶπη κ.τ.λ. is shortly resumed by ὅταν δὲ ὑποταγῇ κ.τ.λ., ver. 28. See regarding δέ after parentheses or interruptions, Hartung, *Partik.* I. p. 172 f. But, in the first place, δῆλον ὅτι κ.τ.λ. is a very essential point, no mere parenthetical thought in the course of the argument; and, secondly, the resumption after so short and plain an intercalation would be alike uncalled for, and, through the change in the mode of expression (not again with εἶπη), obscure. — ἐκτὸς τοῦ ὑποτάξ.] *i.e.* with the exception of *God*; but Paul designates God as *the subjecting subject*: “quo clarius in oculos incurreret, rem loqui ipsam,” van Hengel.

Ver. 28. What Paul had just presented in the, as it were, poetically elevated form ὅταν δὲ εἶπη κ.τ.λ., he now sums up in the way of simple statement by ὅταν δὲ ὑποταγῇ κ.τ.λ., in order to make the further element in his demonstration follow in accordance with the δῆλον ὅτι κ.τ.λ. — καὶ αὐτός] *the Son Himself* also shall be subjected,¹ not of course against His will, but as willingly yielding compliance to the expiry of His government. The Son wills what the Father wills; His undertaking is now completed—the becoming subject is His “last duty” (Ewald). Here, too, especially by the older interpreters, a great deal of dogmatic theology has been imported, in order to make the apostle not teach—what, in truth, he does teach with the greatest distinctness—that there is a cessation of the rule of Christ. The commonest expedient (so Augustine, *de Trin.* i. 8, and Jerome, *adv. Pelag.* i. 6, and the majority of the older expositors) is that Christ *according to His human nature* is meant, in connection with which Estius and Flatt take ὑποταγ. as: *it will become very manifest that, etc.* Ambrosiaster, Athanasius, and Theodoret even explained it, like Χριστός in xii. 12, of the *corpus Christi mysticum*, the church. Chrysostom also imports the idea (comp. Theophylact and Photius in Oecumenius) that Paul is describing τὴν πολλὴν πρὸς τὸν πατέρα ὁμόνοιαν. — ἵνα ἡ ὁ θεὸς τὰ πάντα ἐν παῶσιν] aim not of ὑποτάξαντι αὐτ. τ. π. (Hofmann), but of αὐτὸς ὁ υἱὸς ὑποταγῆς. κ.τ.λ., which is indeed the main point in the progress of the argument, the addition of its final aim now placing the reader at the great copestone of the whole development of the history of salvation. The object aimed at in the Son's becoming subject under God is the absolute sovereignty of God: “*in order that God may be the all in them all,*” *i.e.* in order that *God* may be the only and the immediate all-determining principle in the inner life of all the members of the kingdom hitherto reigned over by Christ.² Not as though the hitherto

¹ ὑποταγήσεται is to be left passive (in opposition to Hofmann). God is the ὑποτάσσων. Comp. Rom. viii. 20. But Christ is subject

ἔκων. Comp. ver. 24.

² Melanchthon: “Deus . . . immediate se ostendens, vivificans et effundens in

continued rule of Christ had *hindered* the attainment of this end (as Hofmann objects), but it has *served* this end as its final destination, the complete fulfilment of which is the complete "glory of God the Father" (Phil. ii. 11) to eternity. "Significatur hic novum quiddam, sed idem summum ac perenne . . . ; hic finis et apex ; ultra ne apostolus quidem quo eat habet," Bengel. According to Billroth, this expresses the realization of the identity of the finite and the infinite spirit, which, however, is unbiblical.¹ See in opposition to the pantheistic misunderstanding of the passage, J. Müller, *v. d. Sünde*, I. p. 158 f. Olshausen (following older interpreters in Wolf) and de Wette (comp. Weizel and Kern, also Scholten in the *Tüb. Jahrb.* 1840, 3, p. 24) find here the doctrine of restoration favoured also by Neander, so that *ἐν πᾶσι* would apply to *all creatures*, in whom God shall be the all-determining One. But that would involve the conversion even of the demons and of Satan, as well as the cessation of the pains of hell, which is quite contrary to the doctrine of the New Testament, and in particular to Paul's doctrine of predestination. The fact was overlooked that *ἐν πᾶσι* refers to the members of the kingdom hitherto ruled over by Christ, to whom the condemned, who on the contrary are outside of this kingdom, do not belong, and that the continuance of the condemnation is not done away even with the subjugation of Satan, since, on the contrary, the latter himself by his subjugation falls under condemnation. See, moreover, against the interpretation of restoration, on ver. 22, and Weiss, *bibl. Theol.* p. 431 ; Georgii in the *Tüb. Jahrb.* 1845, 1, p. 24 ; van Hengel *in loc.* — *ἐν πᾶσιν*] is just as necessarily *masculine* as in Col. iii. 11. The context demands this by the correlation with *αὐτὸς ὁ υἱὸς κ.τ.λ.*, for up to this last consummation the Son is the regulating governing principle in all, but now gives over His kingdom to the Father, and becomes Himself subject to the Father, so that then the *latter* is the all-ruling One in *all*, and no one apart from Him in *any*. This in opposition to Hofmann, who takes *ἐν πᾶσιν* as *neuter*, of the *world*, namely, with regard to which God will constitute the entire contents of its being in such a way as to make it wholly the created manifestation of His nature ; the new heaven and the new earth, 2 Pet. iii. 13, is only another expression, he holds, for the same thing. This introduction of the palinogenesis of the universe, which is quite remote from the point here, is a consequence of the incorrect reference of *ἵνα* (see above). Moreover, if the meaning was to be : "All in the all," *πᾶσι* would require the retrospective article, which *πάντα* has in ver. 27 and ver. 28a. See a number of examples of *πάντα* and *τὰ πάντα ἔστι* in the specified sense in Wetstein, Locella, *ad Xen. Eph.* p. 209. Comp. on Col. iii. 11, and Hermann, *ad Viger.* p. 727. (x²)

Ver. 29.² 'Επεὶ] *for*, if there is nothing in this eschatological development

beatos suam mirandam lucem, sapientiam, justitiam et laetitiam."

¹ Equally unbiblical are the similar interpretations of the perishing (*ἀπώλεια*) of the individual existence and the regeneration of the universe to form an immediate absolute theocracy (Beck, comp. Rothe).

² See on the passage, Rückert, *Expos. loci P. 1 Cor. xv. 29*, Jena, 1847 ; Otto in his *dekalog. Unters.* 1857 ; Diestelmann in the *Jahrb. f. d. Theol.* 1861, p. 522 ff. ; Linder in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1862, p. 571 f., and in the *Luther. Zeitschr.* 1862, p. 627 ff. ; Isenberg in the *Meklenb. Zeitschr.* 1864-65, p. 779 ff. ;

onward to the end, when God will be all in all, *what shall those do, i.e.* how absurdly in that case will those act, *who have themselves baptized for the dead?* Then plainly the result, which they aim at, is a chimera! Usually interpreters have referred ἐπεὶ back to ver. 20, and regarded what lies between as a digression; Olshausen is more moderate, considering only vv. 25–28 in that light, so also de Wette; Rückert, again, holds that Paul had perhaps rested from writing for a little after ver. 28, and had had the sentence “*the dead arise*” in his mind, but had not expressed it. Pure and superfluous arbitrariness; as always, so here too, ἐπεὶ points to what has immediately preceded. But, of course, in this connection the final absolute sovereignty of God is conceived as *conditioned by the resurrection of the dead*, which, after all that had been previously said from ver. 20 onwards, presented itself to every reader as a thing self-evident. Hofmann makes ἐπεὶ refer to the whole paragraph beginning with ἀπαρχὴ Χριστός, as that is construed by him, down to ver. 26, to which vv. 27, 28 have attached themselves as confirming the final abolition of death. But see on vv. 24, 27. — Upon the words which follow all possible acuteness has been brought into play, in order just to make the apostle not say *that* which he *says*. — τί ποιήσουσιν] makes palpable the *senselessness*, which would characterize the procedure in the case assumed by ἐπεὶ. The *future* is that of the general proposition,¹ and applies to every baptism of this kind which should occur. Every such baptism will be without any meaning, if the deniers of the resurrection are in the right. Grotius: “quid *efficient*” (comp. Flatt). But that a baptism of such a kind *effected* anything, was assuredly a thought foreign to the apostle. He wished to point out the *subjective* absurdity of the procedure in the case assumed. The interpretation: “*nescient quid agendum sit*” (van Hengel) does not suit the connection, into which Ewald also imports too much: “are they to think, that they have cherished faith and hope in vain?” — ὑπὲρ τῶν νεκρῶν] The article is *generic*. Every baptism which, as the case occurs, is undertaken for a dead person, is a baptism *for the dead*, namely, as regards the *category*. It must have been something not wholly unusual in the apostolic church, familiarity with which on the part of the readers is here taken for granted, that persons had themselves baptized once more for the benefit of (ὑπὲρ) people who had died *unbaptized* but *already believing*, in the persuasion that this would be counted to them as their own baptism, and thus as the supplement of their conversion to Christ which had already taken place inwardly, and that they would on this account all the more certainly be raised up with the Christians at the Parousia, and made partakers of the eternal Messianic salvation.² This custom propagated and maintained itself afterwards only among heretical sects, in particular among the Cerinthians (Epiphanius, *Haer.* xxviii. 7) and among the Marcionites (Chrysostom; comp., moreover,

Köster in the *Luther. Zeitschr.* 1866, p. 15 ff. Comp. also Elwert, *Quaest. et obs. ad philol. sacram.*, Tüb. 1860, p. 12 ff. The various interpretations of older expositors may be seen especially in Wolf.

¹ Comp. Krüger, § liii. 7. 1; Elwert, p. 17;

Fritzsche, *ad Matth.* p. 457; *ad Rom.* II. p. 9.

² It is to be noted that Paul does not speak at all in a self-inclusive way, as if of something common to all, but as of *third persons*, τί ποιήσουσιν κ.τ.λ. He designates only those who did it. Comp. already Scaliger.

generally Tertullian, *de resurr.* 48, *adv. Marc.* v. 10).¹ Among the great multitude of interpretations (Calovius, even in his time, counts up twenty-three), this is the only one which is presented to us by the words. Ambrosiaster first took them so ;² among the later interpreters, Anselm, Erasmus, Zeger, Cameron, Calixtus, Grotius, *al.*; and recently, Augusti, *Denkwürdigk.* IV. p. 119 ; Winer, p. 165 [E. T. 219] ; Billroth, Rückert, de Wette, Maier, Neander, Grimm, Holtzmann (*Judenth. u. Christenth.* p. 741) also Kling and Paret (in Ewald's *Jahrb.* IX. p. 247 f.), both of which latter writers call to their aid, on the ground, it is true, of xi. 30, the assumption of a pestilence having then prevailed in Corinth. The usual objection, that Paul would not have employed for his purpose at all, or at least not without adding some censure, such an abuse founded on the belief in a magical power of baptism (see especially, Calvin *in loc.*), is not conclusive, for Paul may be arguing *ex concessio*, and hence may allow the relation of the matter to evangelical truth to remain undetermined in the meantime, seeing that it does not belong to the proper subject of his present discourse. The abuse in question must afterwards have been condemned by apostolic teachers (hence it maintained itself only among heretics), and no doubt Paul too aided in the work of its removal. For to assume, with Baumgarten-Crusius (*Dogmengesch.* II. p. 313), that he himself had never at all disapproved of the βαπτίζεσθαι ὑπὲρ τῶν νεκρῶν, or to place, with Rückert, the vicarious baptism in the same line with the vicarious death of Christ, is to stand in the very teeth of the fundamental doctrine of the Pauline gospel—that of faith as the subjective ethical “*causa medians*” of salvation. For the rest, Rückert says well : “*Usurpari ab eo morem, qui ceteroqui displiceret, ad errorem, in quo impugnando versabatur, radicitus evellendum, ipsius autem reprehendendi aliud tempus expectari.*” The silent disapproval of the apostle is brought in by Erasmus in his Paraphrase : “*Fidem probo, factum non probo ; nam ut ridiculum est, existimare mortuo succurri baptismo alieno, ita recte credunt resurrectionem futuram.*” Epiphanius, *Haer.* 28, explains it of the baptism of the *clinici*, of the catechumens on their deathbed, who πρὸ τῆς τελευτῆς λουτροῦ καταξιοῦνται. So Calvin, although giving it along with another interpretation equally opposed to the meaning of the words ; also Flacius, Estius, *al.* But how can ὑπὲρ τ. νεκρ. mean *jamjam morituri* (Estius) ! or how can the rendering “*ut mortuis, non vivis prosit*” (Calvin) lead any one to guess that the “*baptismus clinicorum*” was intended, even

¹ Chrysostom says that among the Marcionites, when a catechumen died unbaptized, some one hid himself under the bed ; then they asked the dead man if he wished to be baptized, and on the living one answering affirmatively, they baptized the latter ἀντι τοῦ ἀπελθόντος. Of the Cerinthians, again, Epiphanius says, *l.c.* : καὶ τὸ παραδόσεως πρᾶγμα ἦλθεν εἰς ἡμᾶς, ὥς τινῶν μὲν παρ' αὐτοῖς προφθανόντων τελευτῆσαι ἄνευ βαπτίσματος, ἄλλους δὲ ἀντ' αὐτῶν εἰς ὄνομα ἐκείνων βαπτίζεσθαι ὑπὲρ τοῦ μὴ ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει ἀναστάντας αὐτοὺς δικὴν δοῦναι τιμωρίας,

βάπτισμα μὴ εἰληφότας. Tertullian does not name the Marcionites, but quotes the explanation of our text as applying to the vicarious baptism, without approving of it.

² “*In tantum stabilem et ratam vult ostendere resurrectionem mortuorum, ut exemplum det eorum, qui tam securi erant de futura resurrectione, ut etiam pro mortuis baptizarentur, si quem mors praevenisset, timentes ne aut male aut non resurgeret, qui baptizatus non fuerat. . . . Exemplo hoc non factum illorum probat, sed fidem fixam in resurrectione ostendit.*”

supposing that it had been already customary at that time !¹ Chrysostom, too, runs counter to the words : ὑπὲρ τῶν νεκρῶν, τουτέστι τῶν σωμάτων, καὶ γὰρ ἐπὶ τοῦτο βαπτίζῃ, τοῦ νεκροῦ σώματος ἀνάστασιν πιστεύων. Paul, he holds, has in view the article in the baptismal creed (which, however, certainly belongs only to a later time) : “I believe in a resurrection of the dead.” So, too, on the whole, Pelagius, Oecumenius, Photius, Theophylact, Melanchthon (“profitentes de mortuis”), Cornelius à Lapide, Er. Schmid, and others ; and somewhat to the same effect also Wetstein. Comp. yet earlier, Tertullian : “pro mortuis tingi pro corporibus est tingi.” Theodoret gives it a different turn, but likewise imports a meaning, making the reference to be to the dead body : ὁ βαπτιζόμενος, φησι, τῷ δεσπότῃ συνθάπτεται, ἵνα τοῦ θανάτου κοινωνήσας καὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως γένηται κοινωνός· εἰ δὲ νεκρόν ἐστι τὸ σῶμα, καὶ οὐκ ἀνίσταται, τί δὴ ποτε καὶ βαπτίζεται. Luther’s explanation, adopted again recently by Ewald and others, that “to confirm the resurrection, the Christians had themselves baptized *over the graves of the dead*” (so Glass and many of the older Lutherans ; Calovius leaves us to choose between this view and that of Ambrosiaster), has against it, apart even from the fact that ὑπὲρ with the genitive in the local sense of *over* is foreign to the New Testament, the following considerations : (1) that there is a lack of any historical trace in the apostolic period of the custom of baptizing over graves, such as of martyrs (for Eusebius, *H. E.* iv. 15, is not speaking of baptism), often as churches were built, as is well known, in later times over the graves of saints ; (2) that we can see no reason why just the baptism at such places should be brought forward, and not the *regarding* of these spots as consecrated generally ; (3) that to mark out the burial-places of pious persons who had fallen asleep, would have been in no way anything absurd even without the belief in a resurrection. And lastly, baptism took place at that time not in fonts or vessels of that kind, which could be set over graves, but in rivers and other natural supplies of water. Other interpreters, following Pelagius, refer ὑπὲρ τ. νεκρ. to *Christ*, taking βαπτ. in some cases of the baptism with water (Olearius, Schrader, Lange, Elwert) ; in others, of the baptism with blood (Al. Morus, Lightfoot). τῶν νεκρ. would thus be the plural of the category (see on Matt. ii. 20). But, putting aside the consideration that Christ cannot be designated as νεκρός (not even according to the view of the opponents), the baptism with water did not take place ὑπὲρ Χριστοῦ,² but εἰς Χριστόν ; and the baptism with blood would have required to be forcibly indicated by the preceding context, or by the addition of some defining clause. “*For the benefit of the dead*” remains the right

¹ Bengel also understands it of those who receive baptism, “quum mortem ante oculos positam habent” (through age, sickness, or martyrdom). Osiander agrees with him. But how can ὑπὲρ τ. νεκρ. mean that? Equally little warrant is there for inserting what Krauss, p. 130, imports into it, taking it of baptism in the face of death : “Who caused themselves to receive a consecration to life, while, notwithstanding, they were

coming not to the living, but to the dead.”

² Elwert, p. 15, defines the conception of the βαπτίζεσθαι ὑπὲρ Χριστοῦ : “eo fine et consilio, ut per baptismum Christo addictus quaecunque suis promisit, tibi propria facias.” But that is plainly included in the contents of the βαπτ. εἰς Χ. or ἐν ὀνόματι τοῦ κυρίου, and one does not see from this why Paul should have chosen the peculiar expression with ὑπὲρ.

interpretation. Olshausen holds this also, but expounds it to this effect, that the baptism took place for the good of the dead, inasmuch as a certain number, a *πλήρωμα* of believers, is requisite, which must first be fully made up before the Parousia and the resurrection can follow. But this idea must be implied in the connection ; what reader could divine it ? Olshausen himself feels this, and therefore proposes to render, “ who have themselves baptized *instead* of the members removed from the church by death.” So, too, in substance Isenberg (whose idea, however, is that of a *militia Christi* which has to be recruited), and among the older interpreters Clericus on Hammond, Deyling, *Obss.* II. p. 519, ed. 3, and Döderlein, *Instit.* I. p. 409. But in that case *ὑπὲρ τ. νεκρ.* would be something not at all essential and probative for the connection, since it is plain that every entrance of new believers into the church makes up for the departure of Christians who have died, but in this relation has nothing to do with the resurrection of the latter. This at the same time in opposition to van Hengel’s interpretation, about which he himself, however, has doubts : *for the honour of deceased Christians*, “ quos exteri vituperare vel despicere soleant.” According to Diestelmann, *ὑπὲρ τ. ν.* is *for the sake of the dead*, and means : *in order* hereafter *united with them* in the resurrection *to enter into the kingdom of Christ* ; while the *νεκροί* are *Christ and those fallen asleep in Him*.¹ But it is decisive against this view, first, that there is thus comprised in the simple preposition, an extent of meaning which the reader could not discover in it without more precise indication ; secondly, that *every baptism whatsoever* would be also in this assumed sense a *βαπτίζεσθαι ὑπὲρ τῶν νεκρῶν*, whereby therefore nothing distinctive would be said here, such as one could not but expect after the quite singular expression ; thirdly, that Christ cannot be taken as included among the *νεκροί*, seeing that the resurrection of *the Lord* which had taken place was not the subject of the denial of resurrection here combated, but its denial is attributed by Paul to his opponents only *per consequentiam*, ver. 13. According to Köster, those are meant *who have themselves baptized for the sake of their Christian friends who have fallen asleep, i.e.* out of yearning after them, in order to remain in connection with them, and to become partakers with them of the resurrection and eternal life. But in this way also a significance is imported into the simple *ὑπὲρ τῶν νεκρῶν*, which there is nothing whatever to suggest, and which would have been easily conveyed, at least by some such addition as *συγγενῶν καὶ φίλων*. According to Linder, the *βαπτιζόμενοι* and the *νεκροί* are held to be even the same persons, so that the meaning would be : *if they do not rise (in gratiam cinerum)*, which, however, the article of itself forbids ; merely *ὑπὲρ νεκρῶν* (*νεκρ.* would be in fact *qualitative*) must have been made use of, and even in that case it would be a poetical mode of expression, which no reader would have had any clue to help him to unriddle. Similarly, but with a still more arbitrary importing of meaning, Otto holds that *οἱ βαπτιζόμεν.* are the deniers of the resurrection, who had themselves baptized in order (which is said, according to him, ironically) *to become dead instead of living*

¹ Comp., too, Breitschwert in the *Würtemb. Stud.* X. 1, p. 129 ff.

men. Most of all does Hofmann twist and misinterpret the whole passage (comp. also his *Schriftbew.* II. 2, p. 199 f.), punctuating it thus : ἐπεὶ τί ποιήσ. οἱ βαπτ. ὑπὲρ τῶν νεκρῶν, εἰ ὅλως νεκρ. οὐκ ἐγείρονται ; τί καὶ βαπτίζονται ; ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν τί καὶ ἡμεῖς κινδυνεύομεν ; the thought being : “*If those, who by means of sin lie in death, become subject in their sins to an utter death from which there is no rising, then will those, who have themselves baptized, find no reason in their Christian status to do anything for them, that may help them out of the death in which they lie ;*” nay, *why do they then have themselves baptized ? and why do we risk our lives for them ?* Ὑπὲρ τῶν νεκρ. thus belongs to τί ποιήσ. ; the ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν, placed for emphasis at the head of the last question, applies to the βαπτίζόμενοι. Every point in this interpretation is incorrect ; for (1) to do something for others, *i.e.* for their good, is an *absolute* duty, independent of the question whether there be a resurrection or not. (2) But to do something *which will help them out of death*, is not in the passage at all, but is imported into it. (3) Those who can and should do something for others are the *Christians* ; these, however, cannot have been designated so strangely as by οἱ βαπτίζόμενοι, but must have been called in an intelligible way οἱ πιστεύσαντες perhaps, or at least οἱ βαπτισθέντες. (4) The νεκροὶ can only, in accordance with the context, be simply the *dead*, *i.e.* those who have *died*, as through the whole chapter from ver. 12 to ver. 52. (5) To give to ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν another reference than ὑπὲρ τῶν νεκρῶν, is just as violent a shift as the severance of either of the two from βαπτίζεσθαι, in connection with which they are symmetrically requisite for more precise definition, and are so placed. And when (6) ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν is actually made to mean “*in order to induce them to receive baptism*,” this just crowns the arbitrariness of inserting between the lines what the apostle, according to the connection, could neither say nor think. Moreover, ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν could not have the emphasis, but only the ἡμεῖς introduced with καί, like the βαπτίζ. previously introduced with καί. — εἰ ὅλως νεκροὶ οὐκ ἐγείρ.] Parallel to the conditional clause to be supplied in connection with ἐπεὶ. For Paul conceives of the resurrection of the dead as being so necessarily connected with the completion of the Messianic kingdom that the denial of the one is also the denial of the other. *If universally* (as v. 1) *dead persons cannot be raised up, why do they have themselves baptized also for them ?* since plainly, in that case, they would have *nothing at all* to do for the dead. See, generally, on Rom. viii. 24 ; Pflugk, *ad Hee.* 515 ; Baumelein, *Partik.* p. 152. This “*also*” betokens the (entirely useless) *superinduced* character of the proceeding. To refer εἰ ἐγείρ. still to what *precedes* (Luther and many others, the texts of Elzevir, Griesbach, Scholz ; not Beza) mars the parallelism ; the addition of the conditional clause to ἐπεὶ has nothing objectionable in itself (in opposition to van Hengel), Plato, *Prot.* p. 318 B ; Xen. *Anab.* vi. i. 30, vii. 6. 22 ; 4 Macc. viii. 8. (x²)

Ver. 30. How preposterously *we also* are acting in that supposed case ! — καί] does not, as some fancy, determine the meaning of the preceding βαπτ. to be that of a baptism of suffering, but it adds a new *subject*, whose conduct would likewise be aimless. — ἡμεῖς] *I and my compeers*, we apostolic preachers of the gospel, we apostles and our companions. Paul then, in

ver. 31 f., adduces *himself, his own fortunes*, in an individualizing way as a proof. The argument is, indeed, only for the *continuance of the spirit* (comp. Cicero, *Tusc.* i. 15) ; but this, when hoped for as *blessedness*, has with Paul the resurrection as its necessary condition.

Ver. 31. Ἀποθνῄσκω] *I am occupied with dying*, am a *moribundus*. See Bernhardt, p. 370, and van Hengel. Strong way of denoting the *deadly peril* with which he sees himself encompassed daily. Comp. 2 Cor. iv. 11, xi. 23 ; Rom. viii. 36, and the parallel passages in Wetstein. The *perfect* as in Eur. *Hec.* 431, would have been still stronger. — νή] a very frequent term of asseveration in classical writers (in the New Testament only here), always with the accusative of the person or thing by which the asseveration is made (Kühner, II. p. 396). *By your boasting, which I have in Christ, i.e. as truly as I boast myself of you in my fellowship with Christ, in the service of Christ.* Comp. Rom. xv. 17. The boasting, which takes place on the part of the apostle, is conceived of by him as a moral activity, which *belongs to him*. Comp. the opposite μομφὴν ἔχειν, μέμψιν ἔχειν, and the like, Ellendt, *Lex. Soph.* I. p. 732. — ὑμετέραν] is to be understood *objectively* (Matthiae, p. 1032 ; Mätzner, *ad Antiph.* p. 221 ; Kühner, II. § 627, A. 6). Comp. xi. 24 ; Rom. xi. 31. The expression brings out more strongly the reference to the person (as truly as *ye* are the subject of my boasting). The Corinthians, whose subsistence as a church is an apostolic boast for Paul, can testify to himself what deadly perils are connected with his apostolic work. He thus guards himself against every suspicion of exaggeration and bragging. The asseveration does not serve to introduce what *follows* (Hofmann), since that does not come in again as an assertive declaration, but in a conditional form.

Ver. 32. Something of a special nature after the general statement in ver. 31. — *If I after the manner of men have fought with beasts in Ephesus, what is the profit* (arising therefrom) *to me?* — κατὰ ἄνθρωπον] has the principal emphasis, so that it contains the element, from which follows the negative involved in the question of the apodosis : “*then it is profitless for me.*” And the connection yields from this apodosis as the *meaning* of κατὰ ἄνθρωπον : *after the manner of ordinary men, i.e. not in divine striving and hoping, but only in the interest of temporal reward, gain, glory, and the like, whereby the common, unenlightened man is wont to be moved to undertake great risks.* If Paul has fought in such a spirit, then he has reaped nothing from it, for he καθ’ ἡμέραν ἀποθνῄσκει. The many varying explanations¹ may be seen in Poole’s *Synopsis*. Against Rückert, who explains it : “according to human ability, with the exertion of the highest power,” it may be decisively urged that κατὰ ἄνθρ. in all passages does not denote what is human *per excellentiam*. If, therefore, the context here required that κατὰ ἄνθρ. should express the measure of *power* (which reference, however, lies quite remote), then we must explain it as : *with ordinary human power, without divine power.* According to Rückert’s view, moreover, κατὰ ἄνθρ. would not be at all the

¹ Chrysostom and Theophylact : ὅσον τὸ εἰς ἀνθρώπους, as far as a *beast-fight* can take place in reference to *men*. Theo-

doret : κατὰ ἀνθρώπινον λογισμόν θηρίων ἐγενόμην βορά.

principal element of the protasis, which, however, from its position it must necessarily be. Interpretations such as *exempli causa* (Semler, Rosenmüller, Heydenreich), or *ut hominum more loquar* (Estius), are impossible, since λέγω or λαλῶ does not stand along with it. The conjecture was hazarded : κατὰ ἀνθρώπων (Scaliger). — ἐθηριομάχησα] θηριομαχεῖν, *to fight with wild beasts* (Diod. iii. 42 ; Artem. ii. 54, v. 49), is here a significant *figurative* description of the *fight with strong and exasperated enemies*. So Tertullian (*De resurr.* 48 : “depugnavit ad bestias Ephesi, illas sc. bestias Asiaticae pressurae”), Chrysostom, Theophylact, Oecumenius, Pelagius, Sedulius, Beza, Grotius, Estius, Calovius, Michaelis, Zachariae, Valckenaer, Stolz, Rosenmüller, as well as Schrader, Rückert, Olshausen, de Wette, Osiander, Neander, Ewald, Maier, Hofmann, Krauss. Comp. Appian. *B. C.* p. 763 (in Wetstein), where Pompeius says : οἷσις θηρίοις μαχόμεθα. Ignatius, *ad Rom.* 5 : ἀπὸ Συρίας μέχρι Ῥώμης θηριομαχῶ διὰ γῆς καὶ θαλάσσης, *ad Tars.* 1, *ad Smyrn.* 4. Comp. Tit. i. 12 ; 2 Tim. iv. 17 ; Ignatius, *ad Eph.* 7, as also in classical writers *brutal men* are called θηρία ; (Plato, *Phaed.* p. 240 B ; Aristophanes, *Nub.* 184 ; Jacobs, *ad Anthol.* XII. p. 114). See also Valckenaer, p. 332. Paul takes for granted that his readers were acquainted with what he describes in such strong language, as he might assume, moreover, that they would of themselves understand his expression figuratively, since they knew, in fact, his privilege of Roman citizenship, which excluded a condemnation *ad bestias*, *ad leonem*. His lost letter also may have already given them more detailed information. Notwithstanding, many interpreters, such as Ambrosiaster, Theodoret, Cajetan, Erasmus, Luther, Calvin, Cornelius à Lapide, Lightfoot, Wolf, and others, including Flatt and Billroth, have explained this of an *actual fight with beasts*, out of which he had been wonderfully delivered.¹ It is objected as regards the privilege of a Roman citizen (see in particular Flatt), that Paul was in point of fact scourged, etc., Acts xvi. 22 f. But in Acts, *l.c.*, Paul did not appeal to his right of citizenship, but made it known only *after* he had suffered scourging and imprisonment, whereupon he was forthwith set free, ver. 37 ff. Before he was thrown to the beasts, however, he would, in accordance with his duty, have appealed to his right of citizenship, and thereby have been protected. And would Luke in the Acts of the Apostles have left unmentioned an incident so entirely unique, which, among all the wonderful deliverances of the apostle, would have been the most wonderful ? Would not Paul himself have named it with the rest in 2 Cor. xi. 23 ff., and Clement in 1 Cor. 5 ? — Upon the non-literal interpretation,² however, it cannot be proved *whether a single*

¹ From this *literal* interpretation arose the legend in the apocryphal *Acta Pauli* in Nicephorus, *H. E.* ii. 25 (p. 175, ed. Paris, 1630), that he was thrown first of all to a lion, then to other beasts, but was left untouched by them all.—Van Hengel (comp. previously his *Annot.* p. 208), while likewise holding fast the literal view, has explained it only of a supposed case : “*Sumamus*, me Ephesi depugnasse cum feris,” etc. But

this would not at all fit into the connection with the *actual* dangers and sufferings which Paul has mentioned before. Observe, on the contrary, the climax : κινδυνεύομεν, ἀποθνήσκω, ἐθηριομάχησα, which latter word brings forward a particular incident, which has occurred, as proof of the general ἀποθνήσκω.

² Which Krenkel also follows in Hilgenfeld's *Zeitschr.* 1866, p. 368 ff., assuming in

event, and if so, which, is meant. Many of the older expositors think, with Pelagius, Oecumenius, and Theophylact, of the uproar of Demetrius in Acts xix. But in connection with that Paul himself was not at all in danger; moreover, we must assume, in accordance with Acts xx. 1, that he wrote *before* the uproar. Perhaps he means no single event at all, but the whole heavy conflict which he had had to wage in Ephesus up to that time with exasperated Jewish antagonists, and of which he speaks in Acts xx. 19 : μετὰ . . . δακρύων κ. πειρασμῶν κ.τ.λ. — τί μοι τὸ ὄφελος;] *what does it profit me?* The article denotes the definite profit, conceived as *result*. The self-evident answer is : *nothing!* Comp. ix. 17. As *the* gain, however, which he gets from his fight waged *κατὰ ἄνθρωπον*, he has in view not temporal results, founding of churches and the like, but the *future glory*, which is conditioned by the *resurrection of the dead* (comp. Phil. iii. 10, 11) ; hence he continues : εἰ νεκροὶ κ.τ.λ. — εἰ νεκροὶ οὐκ ἐγείρ.] is referred by the majority of the old interpreters (not Chrysostom and Theophylact, but from Pelagius and Theodoret onwards) to the preceding. It would then be a second conditional clause to τί μοι τὸ ὄφελος (see on xiv. 6) ; but it is far more suitable to the symmetry in the relation of the clauses (comp. ver. 29) to connect it with what follows (Beza, Bengel, Griesbach, and later expositors). For the rest, it is to be observed that εἰ νεκρ. οὐκ ἐγείρ. corresponds to the thought indicated by κατὰ ἄνθρ. as being in correlative objective relation to it ; further, that Paul has not put an οὖν or even a γάρ after εἰ, but has written asyndetically, and so in all the more vivid and telling a manner ; likewise, that for the apostle moral life is necessarily based on the belief in eternal redemption, without which belief—and thus as resting simply on the abstract postulate of duty—it cannot in truth subsist at all ; lastly, that the form of a *challenge* is precisely fitted to display the moral absurdity of the premiss in a very glaring light, which is further intensified by the fact that Paul states the dangerous consequence of the earthly eudaemonism, which τῇ γαστρὶ μετρεῖ καὶ τοῖς αἰσχίστοις τὴν εὐδαιμονίαν (Dem. 324, 24) in set words of Scripture (comp. Chrysostom), LXX. Isa. xxii. 13. Analogies to this Epicurean maxim from profane writers, such as Euripides, *Alcest.* 798, may be seen in Wetstein ; Jacobs, *Del. epigr.* vii. 28 ; Dissen, *ad Pindar.* p. 500 ; comp. Nicostr. in Stob. *Flor.* lxxiv. 64 : τὸ ζῆν οὐδὲν ἄλλο ἐστὶν ἢ ὅστις ἂν φάγη. See also Wisd. ii. 1 ff. — αὐριον] light-minded concrete expression for what is to be very soon. Comp. Theocr. xiii. 4. — It is not implied, however, in αὐριον γὰρ ἀποθνήσκ. that εἰ νεκροὶ οὐκ ἐγ. includes the denial of life after death absolutely (Flatt, Rückert, *al.*), but Paul conceives of death as the translation of the soul into Hades (comp. however, on Phil. i. 25 f., Remark), from which the translation of the righteous (to be found in Paradise) into the eternal Messianic life is only possible through the resurrection.

Ver. 33 f. The immoral consequence of the denial of the resurrection (ver. 32) gives occasion to the apostle now in conclusion to place over

connection with it a use of language among the primitive Christians based upon

Mark i. 13, which resolves itself into a hypothesis incapable of proof.

against that Epicurean maxim yet a word of moral warning, in order thereby to express that the church should not be led astray, *i.e.* be seduced into immorality (πλανᾷσθε, *passive*, see on vi. 9), by its intercourse with those deniers who were in its bosom (τινὲς ἐν ὑμῖν, ver. 12 ; comp. ver. 34). — φθείρουσιν κ.τ.λ.] justification of the admonition μὴ πλανᾷσθε. The words (forming an Iambic trimeter acatalectic ¹) are from the Thais of the comic poet Menander (see his *Fragmenta*, ed. Meineke, p. 75); although it still remains a question whether Paul really recognized them as an utterance of this comic poet (as a Μενάνδρειος φωνή, Lucian, *Am.* 43), or only generally as a common Hellenic saying, which, just as such, may have been taken up by that poet also. The latter is probable from the proverbial character of the words, and in the absence of any indication whatsoever that they are the words of another. Similar classical passages may be seen in Alberti, *Obs.* p. 356 ff., and Wetstein. Comp. especially, Theognis 35 f. — ἡθῆ χρηστά] *good* morals, the opposite being κακά, Soph. *O. R.* 610, *Antig.* 516, and πονηρά, Plato, *Gorg.* p. 499 E, *Phil.* p. 40 E ; *Plat. Def.* p. 412 E : χρηστότης ἡθους ἀπλαστία μετ' εὐλογιστίας. — ὁμιλίας κακαί] Vulgate : *colloquia mala*. So Luther, Erasmus, and many, including van Hengel and Krauss. Comp. Dem. 1468, 27, 1466, 2 ; Xen. *Mem.* i. 2. 6. But the context does not justify this restriction of the conception. Comp. Beza. Hence it is rather : *good-for-nothing intercourse*, bad company. Regarding the *plural*, comp. Plato, *Pol.* p. 550 B : ὁμιλίαις . . . κακαῖς κεχρηῆσθαι, Soph. *O. R.* 1489 ; Xen. *Mem.* iii. 7. 5, *Hier.* iv. 1. In the *application* the readers were meant to think of intercourse with the deniers of the resurrection, to be on their guard against moral contagion through them. — ἐκνήψατε δικαίως, κ. μὴ ἁμαρτ.] Parallel to μὴ πλανᾷσθε, but representing the readers as already disturbed in the moral clearness and soundness of their judgment, already transferred by the influence of those τινὲς, ver. 34, into a certain degree of moral bondage (intoxication); for the idea of being completely sobered from the condition in which they were *before their conversion* (Hofmann) is remote from the text, as, in particular, the very ground assigned, which immediately follows, points to the hurtful influence of the τινὲς. He separates the church from these individuals among her members ; the former is not to let herself be injured through the latter (v. 6), but to become sober, in so far as she has already through them experienced loss of moral soberness. *Become sober after the right fashion*, properly as it behoves. Comp. Livy, i. 41 : *expergiscere vere* ; Homer, *Od.* xiv. 90 : οὐκ ἐθέλουσι δικαίως μνᾶσθαι, Dem. 1180, 25. Comp. Lobeck, *ad Soph. Aj.* 547. As regards ἐκνήφειν, *to become sober* in a non-literal respect, comp. Plutarch, *Dem.* 20 ; Aret. iv. 3 ; Joel i. 5. Bengel, we may add, says well : “ἐκνήψατε exclamatio plena majestatis apostolicae.” The *aorist* imperative denotes the swift, instant realization of the becoming sober ; μὴ ἁμαρτάνετε,² on the contrary, requires the con-

¹ The reading χρῆσθ' (Lachmann ; Elzevir, with wrong accent : χρῆσθ'), which is, however, almost without support, suits the metre. According to the correct reading, χρηστά, Paul has left the metrical form out of account, perhaps was not aware of it at

all.

² The context gives no warrant for lending (comp. on Eph. iv. 26) to the imperative *vim futuri* (Bengel, Krauss). As regards the general μὴ ἁμαρτάνειν, comp. the ποιῆσαι κακὸν μηδέν, 2 Cor. xiii. 7.

tinuous abstinence from sinning. — ἀγνοσίαν γὰρ κ.τ.λ.] *for some persons have ignorance of God*; how carefully should you guard yourselves from being befooled *by such*! Ἀγνοσία (1 Pet. ii. 15) is the opposite of γνῶσις, see Plato, *Pol.* v. p. 477 A, *Soph.* p. 267 B. The τινές are those spoken of in ver. 12, not, as Billroth arbitrarily assumes, only a small portion of them. The nature of their unbelief in the resurrection is apprehended as in Matt. xxii. 29. The expression ἀγν. ἔχειν, “*gravior est phrasis quam ignorare*,” Bengel. They are *affected* with it. Comp. Stallbaum, *ad Plat. Rep.* p. 574 E. — πρὸς ἐντρ. ὑμ. λέγω] For it *disgraced* the church, that such τινές were within it; all the more alert should it be. Comp. vi. 5, v. 6. Ὑμῖν belongs to λέγω.

REMARK ON vv. 32–34.—Billroth, followed by Olshausen, is too hasty in inferring from ver. 32 that the opponents of a resurrection would themselves have abhorred the maxim φάγωμεν κ.τ.λ. Paul assumes of his readers generally that they abhorred that maxim as anti-Christian; but the τινές among them, who denied the resurrection, must, according to the warning and exhortation vv. 33, 34, have been already carried away in consequence of this denial to a frivolous tendency of life; otherwise Paul could not warn against being led away by their immoral companionship (ver. 33). Nay, several others even must already have become shaken in their moral principles through the evil influence of the τινές; else Paul could not give the exhortations which he does in ver. 34. For that, in ver. 33 f., he is not warning against *mistaking and neglecting of saving truths*, as Hofmann thinks, but against corruption of wholesome habits, consequently against *immorality*, is certain from ἡθῆ in the words of Menander, and from μὴ ἁμαρτ.; hence, also, the danger of going astray is not to be conceived of as having arisen through intercourse with heathen fellow-countrymen (Hofmann), but through association with those τινές in the church, who had become morally careless by reason of the denial of the resurrection. This is demanded by the whole connection. The τινές were sick members of the church-body, whom Paul desires to keep from further diffusion of the evil, alike in faith and in life.

Ver. 35. The discussion on the point, *that the dead arise*, is here closed. But now begins the discussion *regarding the nature of the future bodies*. This is the second, the special part of the apology, directed, namely, against the grounds upon which they disputed the resurrection. — ἀλλ' ἐπεὶ τις] *but*; notwithstanding of my arguments hitherto adduced, *some one will say*. Comp. Jas. ii. 18. “*Objicit in adversa persona quod doctrinae resurrectionis contrarium prima facie videtur; neque enim interrogatio ista quaerentis est modum cum dubitatione, sed ab impossibili arguentis*,” Calvin. — πῶς] This general and not yet concretely defined expression is afterwards fixed more precisely by ποίῳ δὲ σώματι. The δέ places πῶς and ποίῳ δὲ σώματι in such a parallel relation (see Hartung, *Partik.* I. p. 168 f.; Klotz, *ad Devar.* p. 362) that it does not, indeed, mean *or again* (Hofmann), but sets over against the πῶς that which is intended to be properly the scope of the question: *but* (I mean) *with what kind of a body do they come*? Then from ver. 36 onward there follows the answer to the question, which has been thus more precisely formulated. — ἐρχονται] namely, to those still alive at the

Parousia, 1 Thess. iv. 16 f. The *presents* ἐγείρ. and ἔρχ. bring what is in itself future vividly before us as a *present object of contemplation*. Comp. Dissen, *ad Pind. Nem.* iv. 39. So the same tense may bring the *past* also before us as present (Dissen, *ad Dem. de Cor.* p. 253). Erasmus puts it happily : “*actio rei declaratur absque significatione temporis.*”

Vv. 36–41. In the first place, analogies from the experience of nature,¹ by way of preparation for the instruction, which then follows at ver. 42 ff., regarding the ποιότης of the resurrection-body inquired about. — ἄφρων] The deniers have thus, on the assumption of the identity of the resurrection-body with the body which is buried, found the ποιότης of the former to be inconceivable ; but how *foolish* is this assumption ! The *nominative* is not *address*, because without the article, but *exclamation* ; so that to explain it grammatically we must supply εἰ. Comp. Luke xii. 20 (Lachmann, Tischendorf), and see, generally, Bernhardt, p. 67 ; Winer, p. 172 [E. T. 228] ; Kühner, II. § 507 c, Remark. — σὺ ὁ σπείρεις] *What thou sowest*, is not made alive, etc. The σὺ has the emphasis of the subsequent contrast with the *divine* agency in ver. 38 : *Thou on thy part* ; hence we must not take ἄφρων σὺ together. — ζωοποιεῖται] description (suggested by the thing typified) of the springing up of the seed, which must first of all die ; inasmuch, namely, as the living principle in it, the germ, grows out thereof, and the grain containing it becomes subject to decomposition. Comp. John xii. 24. The ἀποθανεῖν is therefore, in the case of the seed sown, the analogue of the decay of the body buried. As the seed-corn in the earth must die by decomposition, in order to become alive in the springing germ, so must the body decay in the earth in order to become alive in the resurrection-body arising out of it at the resurrection of the dead. That it is not simply the necessity of *dying* to attain the resurrection-life (van Hengel ; comp. Rückert and Holsten z. *Ev. d. Paul. u. Petr.* p. 374) which is depicted, is clear from this, that in the explanation of the *resurrection* the being sown necessarily represents the *burial*, and consequently the ἀποθανεῖν of the *seed-corn*, because it *follows after* the being sown, must correspond to the *decay* of the body. (z²)

Ver. 37. Καὶ ὁ σπείρεις] *And what thou sowest*,—*not the body, which is to be, sowest thou.* ὁ σπείρεις makes the attention rest upon itself first in general, independently of what follows, which forms a complete sentence by itself. See on Matt. vii. 24, x. 14 ; Luke xxi. 6. What shall spring out of the grain, *the plant*, Paul calls τὸ σῶμα τὸ γερνησόμ., because he has it before his mind as the analogue of the resurrection-body. The emphasis, however, lies upon τὸ γερνησ. — γυμνὸν κόκκον] *a naked grain*, which is not yet *clothed*, as it were, with a plant-body (see what follows). Comp. 2 Cor. v. 3. To this future plant-body corresponds the future resurrection-body with which that, which is buried and decays, is clothed. That it is not the soul or the πνεῦμα of the departed which corresponds to the γυμνὸς κόκκος (Holsten), is shown by ὁ σπείρεις ; comp. with ver. 42 ff. — εἰ τύχοι σίτου] *it may be of wheat*. Here, too, εἰ τύχοι does not mean, *for example*, but, *if it so happens* (that thou art just sowing wheat). See on xiv. 10. — ἢ τινος τῶν λοιπῶν] *neuter*,

¹ Comp. Clement, 1 Cor. 24.

We are to supply from the connection *σπερμάτων*. Comp. Nägelsbach on the *Iliad*, p. 304, ed. 3.

Ver. 38. Ὁ δὲ θεός] setting over against the σὺ δὲ σπείρεις, ver. 36, what is done *on God's part* with the seed which on man's part is sowed. — ἡθέλ.] *has willed*. It denotes the (already at the creation) completed act of the divine volition as embodied in the laws of nature. — καί] *and indeed*, as iii. 5. — The *diversity of the* (peculiar, ἰδίων) *organisms*, which God bestows upon—*i.e.* causes to spring forth out of—the different seeds sown, while preserving the identity of the kinds, exposes all the more the folly of the question : ποίῳ δὲ σώματι ἔρχονται, in so far as it was meant to support the denial of the resurrection. As if God, who gives such varied plant-bodies to the sown grains, each according to its kind, could not also give new resurrection-bodies to the buried dead! How foolish to think that *the same* body which is buried (as *e.g.* the Pharisees conceived of the matter) must come forth again, if there is a resurrection! Every stalk of wheat, etc., refutes thee!

Vv. 39-41. In order to make it conceivable that *the same* body need not come forth again, further reference is now made to the manifold *diversity* of organic forms in nature; so also faith in the resurrection cannot be bound up with the assumption of the sameness of the present and the future bodily organism. Very diverse are, namely: (1) the kinds of animal flesh (ver. 39); (2) the heavenly and earthly bodies (ver. 40); and (3) the lustre of the sun, of the moon, and of the stars (ver. 41). — σὰρξ κτηνῶν] flesh of *cattle*, *i.e.* not *quadrupedum* generally (so de Wette and Osiander, following older interpreters), but also not simply *jumentorum* (van Hengel), but *pecorum* (Vulgate), which are kept for household use and for burden-bearing; Plato, *Crit.* p. 109 B; Herod. ii. 41; Xen. *Anab.* iii. 1. 19, iv. 7. 17; Luke x. 34; Acts xxiii. 24. — σώματα ἐπουράνια] *heavenly bodies*, *i.e.* bodies to be found in heaven. Comp. on John iii. 12; Phil. ii. 10. The *bodies of the angels* are meant by this (Matt. xxii. 30; Luke xx. 36; Phil. *l.c.*). So, too, de Wette.¹ Were we to understand by these words, as is *usually* done (so, among others, Hofmann; Hahn, *Theol. d. N. Test.* I. p. 265; Delitzsch, *Psychol.* p. 66; Philippi, *Glaubensl.* II. p. 292 f.), the *heavenly bodies* (sun, moon, and stars), we should be attributing to the apostle either our modern use of language, or the non-biblical mode of regarding the stars as living beings (see Galen, *de usu part.* 17 in Wetstein²), which is not to be proved even from Job xxxviii. 7. The same holds in opposition to Billroth, who understands the words as meaning *heavenly organisms* generally and indefinitely, from which sun, moon, and stars are then named *by way of example*. Sun, moon, and stars are *not* comprehended *at all* under σώματα ἐπουρ., and are first adduced in ver. 41 as a *third analogue*, and that simply in reference to their manifold δόξα. The whole connection requires that σώματα should be *bodies* as *actual organs of life*, not inorganic things and materials; as, for instance, stones (Lucian, *vitt. auct.* 25), water (Stob. *fl. app.* ii. 3), and

¹ Comp. also Kurtz, *Bibel u. Astron.* p. 157; Holsten, *z. Ev. d. Paul. u. Petr.* p. 72 f.

² Chrysostom and Theophylact (comp. also Theodoret) go entirely astray, suppos-

ing that σώμ. ἐπουρ. denotes the *pious*, and σώμ. ἐπίγεια the *godless*, in spite of the δόξα which is attributed to both.

material things generally (Plato, *Polit.* p. 288 D) are designated in Greek writers—not, however, in the New Testament—by *σῶμα*. Had Paul meant heavenly bodies in the modern sense, he would in that case, by describing them as *bodies*, have committed a *μετάβασις εἰς ἄλλο γένος*; whereas, on the contrary, the bodies of the *angels*, especially when we consider the similarity of those who are raised up to the angels, which was taught by Jesus Himself, were essentially included as relevant to the subject in the list of the diversities of bodily organization here enumerated (in opposition to Hofmann's objection). He then, ver. 41, brings forward in addition the heavenly bodies only in respect of the diversity—not of their *bodies*, but—of the *lustre of their light*. — *σώματα ἐπίγεια*] *bodies to be found on earth*, that is, the *bodies of men and beasts*. — Both kinds of bodies, the heavenly and earthly, are of different sorts of peculiar *glory*,—the former encompassed with a heavenly radiance (Matt. xxviii. 3; Acts xii. 7, *al.*), the latter manifesting strength, grace, beauty, skilful construction, and the like in their outward appearance. Notice that in ver. 40 *ἑτέρα* is used, because the subjects are of specifically different kinds and qualities. It is otherwise in ver. 41, comp. ver. 39. — Ver. 41. *Sun-lustre is one thing, and moon-lustre another, and lustre of stars another (i.e. another than solar and lunar lustre)*. Paul uses, however, *ἀστέρων*, not *ἀστέρος*, because the stars too among themselves have not one and the same lustre; hence he adds by way of explanation: *for star differs from star in lustre*. *Διαφέρει* is thus simply *differt* (Vulgate), not *excellit* (Matt. vi. 26, x. 31, xii. 12), which the context does not suggest. Regarding *ἐν* with *διαφέρει*, comp. Plato, *Pol.* viii. p. 568 A; Dem. 291, 17; Bremi, *ad Isocr.* I. p. 169. The accusative or dative of more precise definition is more usual (Lobeck, *ad Phryn.* p. 394). The design of ver. 4 is not to allude to the different degrees of glory of the bodies of the saints (Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Théodoret, Calovius, Estius, *al.*), which is neither indicated in what precedes nor adverted to in the application ver. 42 ff., and hence has no foundation in the context; but Calvin rightly remarks: “Non disputat, qualis futura sit conditionis differentia inter sanctos post resurrectionem, sed quid nunc differant corpora nostra ab iis, quae olim recipiemus . . . ac si diceret: nihil in resurrectione futurum doceo, quod non subjectum sit jam omnium oculis.” Comp. also Krauss. — Generally, let us beware of forcing upon the individual points in vv. 39–41 different individual references also,¹ contrary to the application which the apostle himself makes in vv. 42–44.

Vv. 42–44. Application of the passage from ver. 36 (*σπείρεται*) on to ver. 41. — *οὕτω καὶ ἡ ἀνάστασις τ. νεκρ.] sc. ἐστι.* *So does it hold also with the resurrection of the dead*, in so far, namely, as the resurrection-body will be quite otherwise constituted than the present body.²—*It is sown in corruption*, etc.

¹ Tertullian, *de resurr.* 52, may serve as a warning; he says on ver. 39: “Alia caro hominis, *i.e.* servi Dei; alia jumentum, *i.e.* ethnici; alia volucrum, *i.e.* martyrum; alia piscium, *i.e.* quibus aqua baptismatis sufficit.” On ver. 41, again: “alia solis gloria, *i.e.*

Christi; alia lunae, *i.e.* ecclesiae; et alia stellarum, *i.e.* seminis Abrahæ.”

² It is to be observed that Paul, in his whole discussion regarding the *nature* of the future bodies, has in view only those of the first resurrection (see on ver. 23), leav-

What is sown and raised up, is self-evident, and is also distinctly *said* in ver. 44, on occasion being given by the adjectival form of expression, into which the discourse there passes. — On *σπείρεται*, the remark of Grotius is sufficient : “cum posset dicere *sepelitur*, maluit dicere *seritur*, ut magis insisteret similitudini supra sumtae de grano.” The apostle falls back on the image of the matter *already familiar* to the readers, because it must have by this time become clear to them in general from this image, that a reproduction of the present body at the resurrection was not to be thought of. The fact, again, that the image of sowing had already gone before in *this* sense,—in the sense of *interment*,—excludes as contrary to the text, not only van Hengel’s interpretation, according to which *σπείρεται* is held to apply to *generation* and *man* is to be conceived as the subject, but also Hofmann’s view, that the sowing is the giving up of the body *to death*, without reference to the point whether it be laid in the *earth* or not. The sowing is *man’s* act, but the *ἐγείρεται* *God’s* act, quite corresponding to the antithesis of *σύν*, ver. 36, and *ὁ δὲ θεός*, ver. 38. — *ἐν φθορᾷ*] *in corruption*, i.e. *in the condition of decay*, is the body when it is buried.¹ Of a wholly different nature, however, will be the new body which raises itself at the resurrection-summons (ver. 52 f.) out of the buried one (as the plant out of the seed-corn) ; *it is raised in the condition of incorruptibility*. Comp. vv. 50, 52. — *ἐν ἀτιμίᾳ*] *in the condition of dishonour*. Chrysostom (*τί γὰρ εἰδεχθέστερον νεκροῦ διαρρύνεντος* ;), Theodoret, Theophylact, Oecumenius, Beza, Grotius, *al.*, including Billroth, have rightly understood this of the *foeditas cadaveris* ; for *σπείρεται* represents the act of *burial*. Erasmus, Calvin, Vorstius, Estius, Rosenmüller, *al.*, including Flatt, (comp. Rückert), hold that it refers to the *ante mortem* *miseriis et foeditatibus obnoxium esse*,” Estius. So also de Wette (comp. Osiander and Hofmann) in reference to *all the three* points, which, according to these expositors, are meant to designate the nature of the *living* body as regards its organization, or at least to *include it* (comp. Maier) in their scope. But this mode of conception, according to which the definition of state characterizes the earthly body *generally according to its nature*, not specially according to the condition in which it is *at its interment*, comes in only at the fourth point with *σῶμα ψυχικόν* in virtue of the change in the form of expression which is adopted on that very account. From the way in which Paul has expressed the first three points, he desires to state in what condition that which is being sown is at its sowing ; in what condition, therefore, the body to be buried is, *when it is being buried*. This, too, in opposition to Ewald’s view : “even the best Christians move *now* in corruption, *in outward dishonour before the world*,” etc. — *ἐν δόξῃ*] refers to the *state of outward glory*, which will be peculiar to the resurrection-bodies ; ver. 40. It is the *σύμμορφον εἶναι τῷ σώματι τῆς δόξης Χριστοῦ*, Phil.

ing quite out of account the bodies of those who shall belong to the second resurrection, and consequently to the *τέλος*, ver. 24. He has in fact to do with *believers*, with future sharers in the resurrection of the righteous (comp. on Phil. iii. 11), whose

resurrection-hope was being assailed.

¹ Not as Hofmann would have it, in connection with his inappropriate interpretation of *σπείρεται* : *up to the point, when it is given over to death*.

iii. 21. — ἐν ἀσθενείᾳ] not : “variis morbis et periculis obnoxium,” Rosenmüller and others, comp. Rückert (weakliness) ; for it refers to the already *dead* body (σπείρεται), but : *in the condition of powerlessness*, inasmuch as all ability, all ἰσχὺς (Soph. *Oed. Col.* 616) all σθένος of the limbs (Pindar, *Nem.* v. 72, x. 90) has vanished from the dead body. Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Theodoret, Theophylact, *al.*, narrow the reference too much in an arbitrary way, applying it simply to the inability to withstand corruption. *Ev ἀσθ.* is not a *superfluous* (de Wette), but a *characteristic* mark which specifically distinguishes the dead from the living body. — ἐν δυνάμει] *in the condition of strength* : the resurrection body will be endowed with fulness of strength for life and activity. What Grotius adds : “cum sensibus multis, quos nunc non intelligimus,” is perhaps true in itself, but is not conveyed in ἐν δυνάμει. — Instead of adducing one by one further qualities of the body as buried, with their opposites in the resurrection-body, Paul sums up by naming in addition that which conditions those other qualities, the *specific fundamental nature* of the present body which is buried, and of the future one which is raised : σπείρεται σῶμα ψυχικόν, ἐγείρ. σ. πνευματικόν, *i.e.* *there is sown a psychical body*, etc. This is not opposed to the identity of the body, but the one which rises is *quite differently qualified* ; there is buried a ψυχικόν, there rises a πνευματικόν. That is the *new ποιότης τοῦ σώματος* in which the risen man comes (ver. 35) ; but the expression, which sets forth the difference as two subjects, is stronger and more significant than if we should take it with Hofmann : *it is sown as a psychical body*, etc. — The body which is buried is ψυχικόν, inasmuch as the ψυχή, this power of the sensuous and perishable life (comp. on ii. 14), was its life-principle and the determining element of its whole nature (consisting of flesh and blood, ver. 50). The ψυχή had in it, as Oecumenius and Theophylact say, τὸ κῦρος κ. τὴν ἡγεμονίαν. The resurrection-body, however, will be πνευματικόν, *i.e.* not an *ethereal* body (Origen, comp. Chrysostom),¹ which the antithesis of ψυχικόν forbids ; but a *spiritual body*, inasmuch as the πνεῦμα, the power of the supersensuous, eternal life (the true, imperishable ζωή), in which the Holy Spirit carries on the work of regeneration and sanctification (Rom. viii. 16, 17), will be its life-principle and the determining element of its whole nature. In the earthly body the ψυχή, not the πνεῦμα, is that which conditions its constitution and its qualities, so that it is framed as the organ of the ψυχή ;² in the resurrection-body the reverse is the case ; the πνεῦμα, for whose life-activity it is the adequate organ, conditions its nature, and the ψυχή has ceased to be, as formerly, the ruling and determining element. We are not, however, on this account to assume, with Rückert, that Paul conceived the soul as not continuing to subsist for ever,—a conception which would do away with the essential completeness and thereby with the identity of the human being. On the contrary, he has conceived of the πνεῦμα in the

¹ Or as Zeller in the *theol. Jahrb.* 1852, p. 297, would have it : “a body composed of spirit,” the πνεῦμα being conceived as material. Comp. Holsten, *zum Ev. d. Paul. u. Petr.* p. 72 : “out of heavenly light-material.”

² Luther's gloss is : “which eats, drinks, sleeps, digests, grows larger and smaller, begets children, etc. *Spiritual*, which may do none of these things, and nevertheless is a true body alive from the spirit.”

risen bodies as the absolutely dominant element, to which the psychical powers and activities shall be completely subordinated. The entire predicates of the resurrection-body, contrasted with the properties of the present body, are united in the *likeness to the angels*, which Jesus affirms of the risen, Matt. xxii. 30, Luke xx. 36, and in their being fashioned like unto the glorified body of Christ, as is promised by Paul, vv. 48, 49 ; Phil. iii. 21. How far the doctrine of Paul is exalted above the assertion by the Rabbins of the (quite crass) identity of the resurrection-body with the present one, may be seen from the citations in Wetstein on ver. 36, and in Eisenmenger, *entdeckt. Judenth.*, II. p. 938 f. — εἰ ἔστι σῶμα ψυχ., ἔστι καὶ κ.τ.λ.] logical confirmation of the σῶμα πνευματ. just mentioned. It is to be shown, namely, that it is not an air-drawn fancy to speak of the future existence of a σῶμα πνευματικόν : *If it is true that there is a psychical body, then there is also a spiritual body*, then such a body cannot be a *non-ens*—according to the mutually conditioning relations of the antitheses. The emphasis lies on the twice-prefixed ἔστι, *existit* (comp. the Rabbinical אֵסֵי in Schoettgen, *Hor.* p. 670). The logical *correctness* of the sentence, again, depends upon the pre-supposition (ver. 42 f.) that the present and the future body stand *in the relation of counterparts* to each other. If, therefore, there exists a psychical body (and that is the present one), then a pneumatic body also must be no mere idea, but really existent (and that is the resurrection-body).

Ver. 45. Scriptural confirmation for the εἰ ἔστι σῶμα ψ. κ.τ.λ. — οὕτω] *so*, i.e. *in this sense*, corresponding to what has been said above, *it stands written also*, etc. The passage is from Gen. ii. 7 according to the LXX. (κ. ἐγένετο ὁ ἄνθρ. εἰς ψ. ζ.), but with the addition of the more precisely explanatory words πρῶτος and Ἀδάμ. The *citation* extends only to ζῶσαν ; the ὁ ἔσχατος κ.τ.λ. that follow are *words of the apostle*, in which he gives an explanation of his οὕτω by calling attention, namely, to the opposite nature of the *last* Adam, as that to which the Scripture likewise pointed by its description of the *first* Adam, in virtue of the typical relation of Adam to Christ. He joins on these words of his own, however, *immediately* to the passage of Scripture, in order to indicate that the ὁ ἔσχατος . . . ζωοποιῶν follows as necessarily from it according to its typical reference, as if the words had been expressed along with it.¹ He thus gives *expression* to the inference which is *tacitly* contained in the statement, by adding forthwith this self-evident conclusion as if belonging also to the passage of Scripture, because demanded for it by the inner necessity of the antithesis. When others, such as Billroth and Rückert, assume that ὁ ἔσχατος κ.τ.λ. is meant really to be a part of the Scripture-quotation, they in that case charge the apostle with having made the half of the citation himself and given it out as being Bible words ; but assuredly no instance is to be found of such an arbitrary procedure, however freely he handles passages from the Old Testament elsewhere. And would the *readers*, seeing that ἐγένετο . . . ζῶσαν is *such a universally known* statement, have been able to recognize in ὁ ἔσχατος κ.τ.λ. Bible words ?

¹ To make the relation of the two halves discernible in reading, let ἐγένετο . . . ζῶσαν be read slowly and loud, pause markedly

at ζῶσαν, and let then ὁ ἔσχατος κ.τ.λ. follow a little less slowly and loudly.

According to Hofmann, οὕτω καὶ γέγρα. is a completed sentence, which only states that the distinction between two kinds of human body is scriptural. In order to demonstrate this scripturalness the apostle then *applies* the passage Gen. ii. 7. But against this it may be urged, *first*, that Paul is wont in general to use the γέγραπται for *citing* passages of Scripture; *secondly*, that the reader could all the less think here of another use of the word, since *in reality* at the moment a passage of Scripture, and that a universally familiar one, is joined on directly, and without a particle (such as γάρ) to lead the thoughts aright in another direction. — ἐγένετο] by his creation, by means of the animation through God's breath. — εἰς ψυχὴν ζῶσαν] לְנֶפֶשׁ חַיָּה, comp. Gen. i. 30, *unto a living soul-nature*, so that thus the *body* of Adam must be formed as the receptacle and organ of the ψυχή, must be a σῶμα ψυχικόν.¹ Therewith sin itself is not assumed as yet, nor even the necessity of its future entrance (comp. Ernesti, *Urspr. d. Sünde*, I. p. 133), but the susceptibility for it, which, however, did not fall within the scope of the apostle here. — ὁ ἔσχατος Ἀδάμ] is *Christ*. Comp. ver. 22; Rom. v. 14; Neve Schalom, ix. 9: "Adamus postremus (הָאָחֳרִי) est Messias." He is called, however, and is *the last Adam* in reference to the *first* Adam, whose antitype He is as the head and the beginner of the new humanity justified and redeemed through Him; but at the same time in reference also to the fact, that after Him no other is to follow with an Adamite vocation. Apart from this latter reference, He may be called also the *second* Adam. Comp. ver. 47. — εἰς πνεῦμα ζωοποι.] *unto a life-giving spirit-being*, sc. ἐγένετο. It is thereby expressed that the body of Christ became a σῶμα πνευματικόν. *But what is the point of time, at which Christ εἰς πνεῦμα ζωοπ. ἐγένετο?* *Not as a created being*, as one of the heavenly forms in the divine retinue before His mission (Holsten), nor yet *in His incarnation*,² whether we may supply mentally a *Deitate* (Beza, comp. too Rübiger, *Christol. Paul.* p. 35; Baur, Delitzsch, *al.*), or take refuge in the *communicatio hypostatica* (Calovius and others); for during his earthly life Christ had a ψυχικόν σῶμα (only without sin, Rom. viii. 3) which ate, drank, slept, consisted of flesh and blood, suffered, died, etc. The one correct answer in accordance with the context, since the point in hand has regard to the *resurrection* (and see especially ver. 44), can only be: *after His death* (comp. Hellwag in the *Tübing. theol. Jahrb.* 1848, 2, p. 240; Ernesti, *Urspr. d. Sünde*, II. p. 122 ff.; Weiss, *bibl. Theol.* p. 314), and indeed *through His resurrection*, Christ became εἰς πνεῦμα ζωοπ. The body, doubtless, of the Risen One before His ascension (hence the Socinians think here of the latter event; so, too, J. Müller and Maier) consisted still of flesh and blood, still ate, drank, etc.; but it was immortal, and so changed (see Remark appended to Luke xxiv. 51) that it already appears as πνευματικόν, although it was only at the ascension that it entered upon its completion in that respect, and consequently into its δόξα as the σῶμα τῆς δόξης (Phil. iii. 21). The event producing the change, therefore, is the resurrection; in virtue of this, the last Adam, who shall appear only at the Parousia in the

¹ Not as if he had lacked the higher life-principle (the πνεῦμα); but the ψυχή was that which determined the nature of the

body.

² So, too, Sellin in the *Luther. Zeitschr.* 1867, p. 231.

whole efficiency of His life-power (ver. 47), *became* (ἐγένετο) εἰς πνεῦμα ζωοποιῶν,¹ and that through God, who raised Him up. — ζωοποιῶν] οὐκ εἶπεν· εἰς πνεῦμα ζῶν, ἀλλὰ ζωοποιῶν τὸ μείζον εἰπὼν, Theophylact. The connection shows *what* ζῶή is meant in ζωοποιῶν, namely, the *resurrection-life*, which Christ, who has become πνεῦμα ζωοπ., works at His Parousia. Comp. ver. 22 ; Phil. iii. 21 ; Col. iii. 4 ; 1 Thess. iv. 16 ; John v. 21 ff. This limitation of the reference of ζωοποιῶν, made in accordance with the context, shows that we have not here an argument proving too much (in opposition to Baur, *neut. Theol.* p. 197).

Ver. 46. After it has been stated and confirmed from Scripture in vv. 44, 45 that *there exists* not simply a psychical, but also a spiritual body, it is now further shown that the latter cannot *precede* the former, but that the reverse must be the case. “*Nevertheless the pneumatic is not first, but the psychical ; afterwards the pneumatic.*” We are not, with the majority of the older commentators (also Flatt, Osiander, Hofmann), to supply σῶμα (which the context does not even suggest) ; but Paul states *quite generally* the law of development,² that the pneumatic appears later than the psychical, a gradation from lower to higher forms, which goes through the whole creation. This general statement he then proves :

Ver. 47, by the concrete phenomena of the two heads of the race of mankind, Adam and Christ. — The principal emphasis is upon πρῶτος and δεύτερος, so that the former corresponds to the πρῶτον, and the latter to the ἔπειτα of ver. 46 ; hence, too, ἔσχατος is not used here again. “The *first* man (not the second) is of earthly origin, earthy (consisting of earth-material) ; the *second* man (not the first) is of heavenly origin.” — ἐκ γῆς χοϊκός] Origin and material nature. Comp. Gen. ii. 7, χοῦν λαβὼν ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς ; Eccles. iii. 20, xii. 7 ; 1 Macc. ii. 63. That the article (John iii. 31) was not required with γῆς (in opposition to van Hengel, who, on account of the lacking article, explains it, *terrenus* sc. *terram sapiens* ; and then χοϊκός ; *humilia spirans*) is clear not only in general (see Winer, p. 114 [E. T. 149]), but also from passages such as Wisd. xv. 8, xvii. 1 ; Eccles. xxxvi. 10, xl. 11. It may be added, that since, by the words ἐκ γῆς χοϊκός, Adam’s body is characterized as ψυχικὸν σῶμα, as in ver. 45, and the psychical corporeity, again, taken purely in itself (without the intervention of a modifying relation), includes mortality (ver. 44), it is clear that Paul regards Adam as *created mortal*, but so that he *would have become immortal, and would have continued free* from death, if he had not sinned. The protoplasts are accordingly in his eyes such as under an assumed condition *potuerunt non mori*, which, however, through the non-fulfilment of this condition, *i.e.* through the Fall, came to nothing ; so that now *death*, and that as a *penalty*, came

¹ There exists no ground for assuming that Paul had a different conception of the corporeity of the risen Christ before His resurrection from that held by the evangelists. It is true that Paul mentions the appearances of the Risen One, ver. 5 ff., in such a way that he speaks of the appearance *after* the ascension, ver. 8, no other-wise than of those which preceded it. But

he had there no *ground* for drawing any such distinction, since it only concerned him generally to enumerate the appearances of the *Risen One*, while for his purpose it was all the same which of them had taken place before and which after the ascension.

² See also Ernesti, *loc. cit.* p. 126.

to be a reality,—a view which agrees alike with his own doctrinal statement, Rom. v. 12,¹ and also with Genesis. For had the protoplasts not sinned, they would, according to Genesis, have remained in Paradise, and would have become immortal (Gen. iii. 22) through the enjoyment of the tree of life (Gen. ii. 9), which God had not forbidden to them (Gen. ii. 16, 17). But they were driven out of Paradise, before they had yet eaten of this tree (Gen. iii. 22); and so, certainly, according to Genesis also, through sin came death into the world as the penalty appointed for them by God (ii. 17). Comp. Augustin, *De pecc. meritis et remiss.* i. 5: “ipsum mortale non est factum mortuum nisi propter peccatum;” see, too, Ernesti, *l.c.* p. 248 f.; Ewald, *Jahrb.* II. p. 153 f. — ἐξ οὐρανοῦ] of heavenly derivation. This applies to the glorification of the body of Christ,² originating from heaven, i.e. wrought by God (comp. 2 Cor. v. 2), in which glorified body He is in heaven, and will appear at His Parousia (comp. Phil. iii. 20). Comp. on ver. 45. According to de Wette (comp. also Beyschlag in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1860, p. 437 f., and *Christol.* pp. 228, 242), it applies to the whole personality of Jesus, “which, through its preponderating spirituality, has also a spiritual body,” or to the heavenly origin characterizing the nature of the whole person (Beyschlag). But the above-given definite reference is the only one which corresponds, in accordance with the text, to the contrast of ἐκ γῆς χοϊκός, which applies to the formation of Adam's body, as well as to the whole point of the development (σῶμα πνευματικόν). Van Hengel is wrong in seeking to conclude from the absence of the article here also, that the heavenly dignity of Jesus is meant. Comp. 2 Cor. v. 2; Gal. i. 8. Paul has the article before οὐρανός or οὐρανοί after ἐκ or ἀπό, only in 1 Thess. i. 10. — No predicate in the second clause corresponds to the χοϊκός of the first half of the verse,³ because the material of the glorified body of Christ transcends alike conception and expression.

Ver. 48. Application to our present and future bodily nature. We are to supply simply ἐστὶ and εἰσὶ. — ὁ χοϊκός] Adam. — οἱ χοϊκοί] all Adam's posterity, as such, in so far as they have the same material nature with their first father. This common nature is the *psychical corporeity*. — ὁ ἐπουράνιος] He who is in heaven (comp. the frequent ἐπουράνιοι θεοί in Homer; Matt. xviii.

¹ In connection with this, no difficulty whatever is occasioned by the ἐφ' ᾧ πάντες ἡμαρτον, Rom. v. 12, according to its correct interpretation, which does not make it refer to the individual sins of the posterity; see on Rom. *l.c.* The Pelagian view, that Adam, even if he had not sinned, would have died, is decidedly against the Pauline doctrinal conception. This in opposition to Schleiermacher, Neander, and others; especially, also, against Mau, *v. Tode, d. Solde der Sünde*, 1841.

² Hence Gess (*v. d. Person Chr.* p. 75) very irrelevantly objects to the reference to the body of Christ, that that body was not from heaven, but from the seed of David. Delitzsch (*Psychol.* p. 334 ff.), by referring

ἐξ οὐρανοῦ back to the incarnation, which is contrary to the context, mixes up things that differ. Beyschlag (comp. also his *Christol.* p. 226) finds in our text a heavenly humanity of Christ (human pre-existence); but the connection and the contrast lead us only to the heaven-derived body of the risen and exalted One. Comp., too, Hofmann and J. Müller, *v. d. Sünde*, p. 412, ed. 5; Weiss, *bibl. Theol.* p. 315 f.

³ Delitzsch, *Psychol.* p. 336, prefers the Marcionitic reading: ὁ δεύτερος κύρ. ἐξ οὐρ., i.e. the second is Lord from heaven. According to the critical evidence, this reading deserves no consideration. Offence was taken at ἄνθρωπος.

35 ; Phil. ii. 10 ; 2 Macc. iii. 39 ; see also on ver. 40), *i.e.* Christ ; not, however, as the *heavenly archetype of humanity*, as which He was pre-existent in God (Beyschlag), but as *the exalted to heaven*, Phil. ii. 9 ; Eph. iv. 8 ff. — οἱ ἐπουράνιοι] These are the risen Christians, inasmuch as they shall be citizens of the heavenly commonwealth, Phil. iii. 20 ; Heb. xii. 22 ; 2 Tim. iv. 18. The common nature of the ἐπουράνιος and the ἐπουράνιοι is the *pneumatic* body. Comp. Phil. iii. 21. Instead of referring the twofold resemblance in kind to the nature of the *body*, Hofmann makes it refer to the nature of the *life*,—on the one side, sinfulness and nothingness ; on the other side, holiness and glory. But the matter is thus turned to its *ethical* side, which Paul cannot have in view here in accordance with the whole connection, which has to do only with the twofold bodily condition—that belonging to the first, and that to the last Adam. This also in opposition to van Hengel.

Ver. 49. The *Recepta* φορέσωμεν is to be retained (see the critical remarks), for which van Hengel, too, decides, although taking τ. εἰκόνα in the moral sense. (A³) An exhortation (φορέσωμεν, defended by Hofmann) lies all the more remote from the connection, seeing that Paul proceeds in his development of the subject with καί, and it is certainly not the *ethical*, but the *physical* conception of εἰκών which is prepared for by what precedes (see still τοιοῦτοι, ver. 48) ; also in what follows, ver. 50, it is not an *ethical*, but a *physiological* relation which is expressed. Beza says well, in opposition to the reading φορέσωμεν and its interpretation : “Hoc plane est detortum, quum res ipsa clamet, Paulum in proposito argumento pergere.” What, namely, was already contained in ver. 48, he now expresses in a yet more definite and concrete way (hence, too, passing over into the first person), bringing out with much emphasis the full meaning of the weighty statement, thus : *And as we have borne* (before the Parousia) *the image of the earthly* (of Adam),—*i.e.* the psychical body which makes us appear as like in kind to Adam,—*so shall we* (after the Parousia) *bear also the image of the heavenly* (of Christ), *i.e.* the pneumatic body. Paul transfers himself and his readers to the turning-point of the Parousia, from which the *aorist* dates backward in the αἰὼν οὗτος, and the *future* forward in the αἰὼν μέλλων. — To extend the “*we*” to *all men* (Krauss) is forbidden by the whole context, and would presuppose the idea of the ἀποκατάστασις πάντων. — Regarding φορεῖν, the *continuous* φέρειν, see on Rom. xiii. 4.

REMARK.—Adopting the reading φορέσωμεν, we should not, with Bengel, import the idea of a *promise*, but take it as *hortative*, with Chrysostom, Theophylact, Erasmus, *al.*, including Hofmann, so that εἰκών would need to be understood *ethically*. Εἰκόνα δὲ χοῖκου τὰς φαύλας πράξεις λέγει· εἰκόνα δὲ τοῦ ἐπουρανίου τὰς ἀγαθὰς, Theophylact. In connection with this Hofmann takes καθὼς *argumentatively* (comp. on Phil. i. 7, ii. 12) : “*seeing that we have borne . . . so must we now also be willing to bear . . .*” But that καθὼς is the ordinary *as* of comparison, is shown by the two comparative clauses in ver. 48, and by the annexing of the καθὼς to them by the simple καί, which continues the comparison in the way of assertion. Moreover, φορέσωμεν would, in fact, not mean, “*we must be willing to bear,*” but, “*Let us bear.*”

Ver. 50. The discussion regarding the nature of the resurrection-body is now closed with a negative axiom, which serves to confirm the *φορέσομεν τ. εἰκ. τ. ἐπουρ.*¹ *But this* (in order to add yet this general statement in confirmation of what has just been said) *I assure you of.* Comp. vii. 29. The sense of a *concession* (for the spiritualistic opponents, so Usteri, Billroth, Olshausen) is imported into the context and the simple *φημί*. According to van Hengel, Paul writes to *obviate* a misapprehension; his readers were not to think that the *φορέσομεν κ. τ. εἰκόνα τοῦ ἐπουρανίου* consisted in the fellowship of the flesh and blood, which Christ had before and after His resurrection. But there was no occasion presented for such an opinion, since the Christian belief was assured that the heavenly Christ has a glorified body (Phil. iii. 21). Hofmann (following Beza) refers *τοῦτο* to *what precedes*, and takes *ὅτι* as introducing the *ground*, *why* the apostle has uttered vv. 46–49. But this ground is of a positive nature, and does not lie in the merely negative thought ver. 50, but much deeper, namely, in the Scriptural (ver. 45) relation of the bodily condition of the earthly and of the heavenly Adam. — *σὰρξ κ. αἷμα*] *i.e.* the bodily nature which we have in this temporal life, the chief constituents of which are flesh and blood,² the latter as the seat of life. *Τὴν θνητὴν φύσιν καλεῖ ἀδύνατον δὲ ταύτην ἐπὶ θνητὴν οὐσαν τῆς ἐπουρανίου βασιλείας τυχεῖν*, Theodoret. Comp. vi. 13. *Σ. κ. αἷμα* is just as little to be taken in the *ethical* sense, which *σὰρξ* by itself elsewhere has, as is *φθορά* afterwards (in opposition to Chrysostom, Theophylact, *al.*) — *οὐδέ]* *and not*, still dependent upon *ὅτι*. This second half of the verse forms with the first a *parallelism*, in which the first clause names the concrete matters, and the second one the *general* class (the categories in question), to which the former belong. The *φθορά*, *i.e.* according to the context (comp. ver. 42), the *corruption* (and to this category flesh and blood belong, which fall a prey to corruption), *inherits* not the *incorruptibility*, to the realm of which belong the relations of the Messianic kingdom, and in particular the glorified body of the sharers in the kingdom. The *abstract* nouns instead of *τὸ φθαρτόν* and *τὸ ἀφθαρτόν* have a certain solemnity. Comp. Dissen, *ad Pind.* p. 476: “*Sublimitatem et πάθος adjuvant abstracta sic posita pro concretis.*” Regarding *κληρονομ.* of the entrance upon the *Messianic* possession, comp. vi. 9; Gal. iii. 29. The *present* sets what is *sure* and *certain* before us as present.

Ver. 51. After Paul has with the weighty axiom in ver. 50 disposed of the question *ποίῳ δὲ σώματι ἔρχονται*, which he has been discussing since ver. 35, a new point, which has likewise a right withal not to be left untouched

¹ According to Tischendorf and Ewald, ver. 50 begins already the new section, and would thus be the introduction to it. Likewise suitable; still at vii. 29 also *τοῦτο δὲ φημί* serves to confirm what has preceded it.

² It is not to the body as such that participation in the Messianic kingdom is denied, but to the *present* body consisting of flesh and blood. Jerome says well: “*alia carnis, alia corporis definitio est; omnis caro*

est corpus, non omne corpus est caro.” In harmony with our passage we should have to read in the third article [of the “Apostles’ Creed”] “*resurrection of the body,*” instead of “*resurrection of the flesh.*” The conception “*glorified flesh*” is for the apostle a *contradictio in adjecto*, which cannot even be justified from his doctrine of the Lord’s Supper.

in this connection, however mysterious it is, now presents itself for elucidation, namely, *what shall happen in the case of those who shall be yet alive at the Parousia*. This last, as it were, appended part of his discussion begins without transition in a direct and lively way (*ιδού*), designated too as *μυστήριον*, as *dogma reconditum*, the knowledge of which Paul is conscious that he possesses by *ἀποκάλυψις*.¹ See on Rom. xi. 25. — πάντες μὲν οὐ κοιμ. κ.τ.λ.] is held by the commentators to mean : *we shall indeed not all die, but all shall be changed*. They either assume a transposition of the negation (so the majority of the older expositors, following Chrysostom, also Heydenreich, Flatt, Osiander, Reiche, and van Hengel); or they hold that Paul had *ἀλλαγ.*, upon which all the emphasis lies, already in his mind in connection with the first πάντες : “ *We all—shall not indeed die until then, but notwithstanding—all shall be changed*,” Billroth, whom Olshausen, de Wette, Maier, follow ; or (so Rückert) the meaning is : *die indeed we shall not all*, etc., so that, according to this view, in pure Greek it would be said : *κοιμηθησόμεθα πάντες μὲν οὐ*.² Three makeshifts, contrary to the construction, and without proof or precedent, in order to bring out a meaning assumed beforehand to be necessary, but which is incorrect, for Paul after ver. 52 can only have applied *ἀλλαγησόμεθα* to those still living at the Parousia, and not, as according to that assumed meaning must be the case, to those already dead. The result of this is, at the same time, that the subject of *οὐ κοιμ.* and *ἀλλαγ.* must be *Paul himself, and the whole of those who, like him, shall yet witness the Parousia* (comp. 1 Thess. iv. 17 : *ἡμεῖς οἱ ζῶντες*), as could not but be clear to the reader from *ἀλλαγ.* Hence we must interpret strictly according to the order of the words : *we shall indeed all not sleep* (i.e. shall not have to go through the experience of dying at the Parousia, in order to become sharers in the resurrection-body, but shall remain alive then), *but shall, doubtless, all be changed*.³ Regarding the subject-matter, comp. ver. 53 ; 1 Thess. iv. 15, 17. This interpretation alone, according to which *οὐ*, in conformity with the quite ordinary use of it (comp. immediately *οὐ δύναται*, ver. 50), changes the conception of the word before which it stands into its opposite (Baeumlein, *Partik.* p. 278), is not merely verbally correct, but also in keeping with the character of a *μυστήριον* ; while, according to the usual way of taking it, the first half at least contains nothing at all mysterious, but something superfluous and self-evident. Our interpretation is adopted and defended by Winer since his fifth edition (p. 517, ed. 7 [E. T. 695]),

¹ Not “ a half confession that now there comes a *private* opinion ” (Krauss, p. 169), which he only with reluctance gives to the public. Comp. also, as against this view, 1 Thess. iv. 15 : *ἐν λόγῳ κυρίου*.

² Comp. Hofmann’s earlier interpretation (in the *Schriftbew.* II. 2, p. 654) : “ Collectively we shall not sleep, but we shall be changed collectively.” Now (*heil. Schr. d. N. T.*) the same writer follows Lachmann’s reading, which, however, he punctuates thus : πάντες μὲν κοιμηθησόμεθα οὐ, πάντες δὲ ἀλλαγ., whereby, on the one hand, the uni-

versality of the dying is denied, whereas on the other the universality of the change is affirmed. Against this interpretation, apart from the critical objections, it may be urged, as regards the sense, that *ἀλλαγ.* cannot be predicated of the dead along with the rest (see ver. 52), and as regards linguistic usage again, that to place the *οὐ* after the conceptions negated by it (Baeumlein, *Partik.* p. 307 f.) is foreign throughout to the New Testament, often as there was opportunity for placing it so.

³ εἰς ἀφθαρσίαν μεταπεσεῖν, Chrysostom.

comp. Ewald and Kling;¹ but it is contested by Fritzsche, *de conform. Lachm.* p. 38; Reiche, *commentar. crit.*; de Wette, van Hengel, Hofmann, Hoelemann, *neue Bibelstud.* p. 276 ff., who, it may be added, looks upon the passage as regards text and interpretation as a "still uncertain" one, but decidedly denies that there is here or in 1 Thess. iv. an expectation of the Parousia as *nigh at hand*. The objections raised against our view are insufficient; for (a) something absurd would result from it only on the supposition of the subject being *all Christians* or Paul and *all his readers*; (b) to make πάντες refer to the whole category of those among whom Paul reckoned himself, that is, to all *who should still live to see the Parousia*, of whom the apostle says that they shall not attain to the new body by the path of death, is not only not inadmissible, but is established in accordance with the context by the predicate ἀλλαγησ., which does *not* include the process of the resurrection (ver. 52); (c) the LXX. Num. xxiii. 13 cannot be used to support the reference of οὐ to πάντες, for in the words of that passage: πάντας δὲ οὐ μὴ ἴδῃς, the well-known use of οὐ μὴ testifies irrefragably in favour of the connection of the negation, not with πάντας, but directly with the verb. Equally unavailable is the LXX. Josh. xi. 13, where by πᾶσας τὰς πόλεις τὰς κεχωματισμένας οὐκ ἐνέπρησεν it is declared of *the whole of* the hill-cities that Israel left them unburnt, so that the negation thus belongs to the verb alongside of which it stands. In Eccles. xvii. 30 also the words οὐ δύναται (it is impossible) belong to each other; in John iii. 16, vi. 29, again, the mode of expression is quite of another kind (in opposition to Buttmann, *neut. Gr.* p. 106 [E. T. 121]). In our text the repetition of πάντες ought to have sufficed of itself to prevent misapprehension of the plain meaning: all we shall at the return of the Lord, in order to our entering glorified into His kingdom, not need first to fall asleep, but shall all be changed living (ver. 52), so that our ψυχικὸν σῶμα shall become a πνευματικόν. (B³)

Ver. 52. *Ἐν ἁτόμῳ, ἐν ῥιπῇ ὀφθ.*] A double, because a thoroughly designed and extremely exact description of *the suddenness* of the ἀλλαγησ., which is meant wholly to exclude even the possibility of those still alive having first, perhaps, to die at the Parousia, in order to come into the resurrection-life. — ἁτομον, *what is indivisible*, an atom (Plato, *Soph.* p. 229 D), is here a little indivisible *point of time*. ἐν ἁτόμῳ ἐν ῥιπήματι, Hesychius. Comp. the phrase, current in Greek writers, ἐν ἀκαρεῖ (Lucian, *As.* 37; Alciphron. iii. 25). — ἐν τῇ ἔσχ. σάλπιγγι] *at the last trumpet*, while it is sounded (by an archangel). See Winer, p. 361 [E. T. 482]. Comp. ἐν ἀνλοῖς, Pindar, *Ol.* v. 45. Paul might also have written: ἀπὸ . . . σάλπιγγος, Polyb. iv. 13. 1. Regarding the subject-matter, comp. 1 Thess. iv. 16, and Lünemann and Ewald on that passage. The *last trumpet* is *that sounding at the final moment of this age of the world*. It does not conflict with this statement, if we suppose that Paul conceived the second resurrection also (ver. 24) to take place with trumpet-sound, for ἔσχ. has its temporal reference in αἰὼν οὗτος. De Wette (so, too, in the form of a suggestion, Vatablus;

¹ Comp. also Holtzmann, *Judenth. u. Christenth.* p. 565.

and comp. previously, Theodoret of Mopsuestia) thinks of the *last among several trumpet-signals*, against which, however, is the simple, not more precisely defined *σαλπίσει γάρ* which follows. This, too, in opposition to Osiander, van Hengel, Maier, and Hofmann. To understand, with Olshausen, who follows older expositors (*τινές* even already in Theophylact), the *seventh* trumpet, Rev. viii. 9, with which, along with the trumpets of Jericho, Hofmann also compares it, is to place it on the same level with the visions of the Revelation, for doing which we have no ground, since in 1 Thess. too, *l.c.*, only one trumpet is mentioned, and that one taken for granted as well known. It is true that the Rabbins also taught that God will sound the trumpet *seven times*, and that in such a way that the resurrection will develop itself in seven acts ;¹ but this conception, too, was foreign to the apostle, seeing that he represents the rising as an *instantaneous* event without breaks of development. It may be added, that the *trumpet* of the Parousia (see, already, Matt. xxiv. 31) is not to be explained away, either with Wolf and others : “*cum signa apparebunt judicii jam celebrandi*,” or, with Olshausen (comp. Maier), of a startling *work of the Spirit*, arousing mankind for a great end. Comp., too, Theophylact, who understands by the *σάλπιγξ* the *κέλευσμα* and *νεῦμα* of God *τὸ διὰ πάντων φθάνον* ; as in substance also Usteri, p. 356, Billroth, Neander, Hofmann.² As regards the phrase in itself, we might compare the Homeric *ἀμφὶ δὲ σάλπιγξεν μέγας οὐρανός*, *Il.* xxi. 388, where the *thunder* (as signal for the onset) is meant. But the connection gives us no right whatever to assume a non-literal, imaginative representation. On the contrary, Paul has in fact carried with him the conception of the resurrection *trumpet* (resting upon Ex. xix. 16) from the popular sphere of conception, attested also in Matt. *l.c.* (comp. 4 Esdr. vi. 24), into his Christian sphere,³ as he then himself adds forthwith by way of confirmation and with solemn emphasis : *σαλπίσει γὰρ κ.τ.λ.] for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead* (the Christians who have already died up to that time) *shall be raised incorruptible, and we* (who are still alive then) *shall be changed*. The *paratactic* expression (instead of *ὅτε γάρ*, or some other such form of subordination) should of itself have been sufficient to prevent the divesting the *σαλπ. γάρ*. of its emphasis by regarding it simply as an introduction to what follows in connection with *ἐν τ. ἐσχ. σάλπ.* (Hofmann); comp. Kühner, § 720, 4 ; Winer, p. 585 [E. T. 785]. A special attention is to be given to the *σαλπίς*. Instead of *ἡμεῖς ἀλλαγ.*, Paul might have written *οἱ ζῶντες ἀλλαγῇσονται* ; but from his persuasion that he should live to see the Parousia, he includes *himself* with the rest.⁴ (c³) Comp. on ver. 51.

¹ “Primo sono totus mundus commovebitur; secundo pulvis separabitur; tertio ossa colligentur . . . tuba septima vivi stabunt pedibus suis.” See Eisenmenger, *entdeckt. Judenth.* II. p. 929.

² Lange in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1836, p. 708, thinks of a *revolution of the earth* which will be the signal of the advent of Christ. Osiander holds that the *victory over the last enemy* (vv. 25, 27) is pointed at. According

to de Wette, it is generally the apocalyptic figure for solemn, divinely-effected catastrophes.

³ The recognition of this *form of conception* by no means implies that a *dogma* is to be made out of it.

⁴ As in 1 Thess. iv. 15 ff., to which passage, however, this one does not stand in the relation of a further advance of development, or more thorough liberation from

Van Hengel is wrong in referring οἱ νεκροί to those *now* (when Paul wrote) already dead, and ἡμεῖς to those *now* still alive, of whom a part will then be also dead ; ἀλλαγ. can apply only to the change of the *living*. — σαλπίζει (sc. ὁ αλπιγκτής) has become in its use just as impersonal as ὕει, νίφει, *al.* See Elmsl. *ad Heracl.* 830 ; Kühner, II. p. 36, and *ad Xen. Anab.* i. 2. 17. The form σαλπίσω instead of σαλπίζω is later Greek. See Lobeck, *ad Phryn.* p. 191.

Ver. 53. Confirmation of what has last been said, κ. ἡμεῖς ἀλλαγ., by the *necessity* of this change. — δεῖ] denotes, in accordance with ver. 50, the *absolute* necessity. — τὸ φθαρτὸν τοῦτο] pointing to it ; Paul looks, as he writes, at his own body. — ἐνδύσασθαι ἀφθαρσ.] *figurative* description (2 Cor. v. 4) of the *process of change to an incorruptible condition of existence* ; ἀθανασίας καὶ ἀφθαρσίας ἐπιούσης αὐτῷ, Chrysostom. The infinitives *arist* are purposely chosen to denote the instantaneous completion.

Ver. 54. Then, however, when this our change has taken place, shall the dominion of death cease ; no one shall die any more. — ὅταν δὲ . . . ἀθανασ.] and, as it were, triumphant repetition of the same weighty words. Comp. Bornemann, *Schol. in Luc.* p. xxxix. Theodoret calls the passage a *song of victory*. All the less is the first clause to be rejected, with Hofmann, on critical grounds. The first corrector of $\aleph$ has rightly restored it. — γενήσεται] *shall come to pass* (in respect of its contents) the word, *i.e.* it shall become actual,—the written word shall become *fact*. Hofmann wrongly takes it : Men shall then *say so*, as it stands written. Where a λόγος or ῥῆμα *goes forth*, *i.e.* is spoken, there stands along with it the preposition of *direction* (as John x. 35, Luke iii. 2, and frequently ; comp. Gen. xv. 1, *al.*), or whence the word comes (as Jer. xxvi. 1), or *through whom* it goes forth (from God ; as Hagg. i. 3). It may be added, that they are not *things simultaneous* which are announced in the protasis and apodosis (as Hofmann objects) ; but when that which is spoken of in the protasis shall have taken place, then, because from this time forward no one shall fall any more under the power of death, shall that be realized, etc. This is the happy *consequence* of that,—the complete victory of the life, which will link itself to that change which shall thus take place in the twinkling of an eye, as to its signal and prelude. — ὁ λόγος] *effatum, oraculum*, 1 Macc. vii. 16 ; Plato, *Phaedr.* p. 275 B ; Pindar, *Pyth.* iv. 105. Comp. Rom. ix. 9 ; John xii. 38, xv. 25. — κατεπόθη κ.τ.λ.] Isa. xxv. 8, not according to the LXX.,¹ but according to the original text ; in quoting which, however, עָלַע is rendered as passive, and נִצַּל is expressed in the way in which it is often rendered in other passages, *e.g.* 2 Sam. ii. 26, Job xxxvi. 7, Jer. iii. 5 (but not here), by the LXX. : εἰς νίκος. The meaning is : *Death has been completely done away*. Comp. 2 Cor. v. 4. This being brought to nought is

Rabbinical reminiscences (Krauss, p. 172) ; for the two passages agree in substance, and they supplement each other. The incapacity, too, of the flesh for inheriting the kingdom forms the necessary presupposition for 1 Thess. iv. 17. And the resto-

ration of all is not taught even in our passage, ver. 54 f., where the final shout of triumph of the *redeemed* (ver. 26 f.) is heard.

¹ Who here translate the words of the prophet incorrectly : κατέπιεν ὁ θάνατος ἰσχύσας.

represented under the image of *being swallowed up* (namely, by God ; see the original text). As regards the event itself, comp. Rev. xxi. 4. — εἰς νῖκος] *unto victory*, i.e. *so that thereby victory*—namely, of the opposing power of eternal life in the future Aeon—is *established* ; εἰς, in the sense of the result.¹ Comp. Matt. xii. 20. Νῖκος is a later form, in place of the old νίκη. See Hermann, *Diss. de Orph.* p. 821. — Since the personified θάνατος is, according to the context, bodily death and nothing more, this passage also (comp. ver. 26) is of no avail for the establishment of the doctrine of restoration (in opposition to Olshausen). Comp. on vv. 22, 28. The passages from the Rabbins, who likewise, upon the ground of Isa. *l.c.*, teach : “*in diebus ejus (Messiae) Deus S. B. deglutiet mortem*,” may be seen in Wetstein.

Ver. 55. Exulting exclamation of joy from the apostle (comp. as to ποῦ, Rom. iii. 27 ; 1 Cor. i. 20), who transfers himself into that blessed future of the γενήσεται κ.τ.λ., ver. 54,² and breaks out, as it were, into an ἐπινίκιον. In doing so, he makes words from the LXX. Hos. xiii. 14 his own, with free alteration. This great freedom in availing himself of the passage almost solely in respect of the assonance of the words, and the whole lyrical cast of the outburst, make it less likely that ver. 55 is still *part of the quotation* (the *common* view ; but see, in opposition to it, van Hengel). — τὸ κέντρον] Paul images to himself death as a beast with a deadly sting (a scorpion, or the like). Billroth, following Schoettgen thinks of a *goat*, which death uses in order to cultivate its field. But this conception is not in the least recalled by the context. Olshausen, too, is wrong in holding that τὸ κέντρον denotes that which elicits the forthputting of strength : “*sin awakens the sleeping strength of death, and the law, again, that of sin.*” Then, plainly, τὸ κέντρον τοῦ θανάτου, ver. 56, would be *that which stings death*, which is impossible according to ver. 55 ! — In the second question, according to the *Recepta* ποῦ σου, ἄδη κ.τ.λ., the (personified) *Hades* is looked upon as having lost the victory ; for it has not only had, in virtue of the resurrection of the bodies, to render up the souls of the departed which lay under its power, but it receives no other souls into its power any more. According to the reading :³ ποῦ σου, θάνατε κ.τ.λ. (see the critical remarks), the new element, which comes as a climax, is brought forward in τὸ νῖκος by way of addition, after a bold repetition of the same address ; so that, putting aside the interrogative form, the meaning of the triumphant outburst is : *Thou death stingest no more*, for no one dies henceforth ; *thou death hast lost the victory*, for the power of eternal life has won it over thee.

¹ According to Osiander, εἰς is *local* ; so that νῖκος is presented under the image of a wild beast, which swallows up its prey. Against this view there is, first, the absence of the article ; secondly, εἰς (we should have expected ὑπό, comp. Polyb. ii. 41. 7) ; lastly, the τὸ νῖκος which follows vv. 55, 57. — Luther's gloss puts it happily and graphically : “*Death lies undermost, and has now no strength left ; but life lies uppermost, and says, Victory !*”

² So, rightly, Chrysostom and Theophy-

lact. According to van Hengel, Paul is speaking of the *present* life, namely, of the joy of *hope*. But it is just the *boldness* of the flight of thought which is the most Pauline feature in our passage. The κέντρον also is taken in too weak a sense by van Hengel, namely, in that of only a hurting, not a deadly sting, by which, in his view, the *terrors* of death are meant.

³ [This reading is so well sustained as to be adopted by all modern editors and critics.—T. W. C.]

Ver. 56 f., still retaining the conception of the *κέντρον* and the *νίκος*, points, by way of happy conclusion (not as introduction to the admonition which follows, as Hofmann would have it), to the firm dogmatic ground upon which this certainty of future victory rests in a connected view of the gospel. "Seeing that death slays through *sin* (Rom. v. 12), and sin, again, is powerful through the *law* (Rom. vii. 7 ff.), it is thus certain that God gives us the victory over death through Jesus Christ." Christ, that is to say, has indeed blotted out sin through His *ἱλαστήριον*, has risen for our righteousness' sake; and has thus withdrawn us from the curse of the law, and withdrawn us by His Spirit from its power to stir up and promote sin (Rom. viii. 1 ff.). In this proof set forth by the apostle, the *summary of his whole gospel* is contained. The *form*, however, is not argumentative, but, in correspondence with the elevated and emotional tone of the passage, such that shadow and light are placed *beside* each other, but with the light breaking forth after the darkness, as in Rom. vii. 25, in the shape of a *cry of thanksgiving*. — τῷ διδόντι] *present*; for this future victory of life over death is for us sure and certain.

Ver. 58. Closing admonition, drawn in the way of inference by ὥστε from τῷ διδόντι ἡμῖν τὸ νίκος διὰ κ.τ.λ. (D³) "Therefore—because you are sure of the victory—*be steadfast*," etc. The εἰδότες κ.τ.λ., which glances back upon that sure νίκος, testifies in favour of this reference of ὥστε; hence we have no adequate ground for referring ὥστε to the whole section (de Wette, van Hengel, *al.*), nay, even for making it extend to the whole Epistle (Hofmann. — ἐδραῖοι, ἀμετακίν.] Comp. Col. i. 23. To conceive of the readers as ethical *athletes* (Beza), is not suggested by the context. What is expressed is *Christian perseverance* in general, under the figure of *standing firm*, comp. vii. 37 (opposite : σαλεύεσθαι, comp. Theodoret), in connection with which, again, ἀμετακίν. presents the perseverance more precisely as *unseduceableness*, both being in opposition to the possible seductions through the deniers of the resurrection. Comp. on ἀμετακίν., Plato, *Ep.* vii. p. 343 A; Dion. Hal. i. p. 520; and on both words, Arist. *Eth.* ii. 4. 3. — περισσεύοντες ἐν τῷ ἔργῳ τ. κ. πάντ.] *abounding in the work of the Lord, i.e. exceedingly active and energetic therein, always*. This more precise definition of περισσ. is confirmed by the correlative ὁ κόπος ὑμῶν (your pains and labour); ἐν, again, denotes the definite *sphere, wherein*, etc. Comp. 2 Cor. viii. 7; Phil. i. 26; Col. ii. 7; Rom. xv. 13. The ἔργον τοῦ κυρίου is *the work which is carried on in the service of Christ*. Comp. xvi. 10. *His* is the work, in which His people labour. And they labour therein, each according to his different calling, by the active fulfilment of His will as *servants of the Lord* (xii. 5). The three points, ἐδραῖοι, ἀμετακ., περισσ. κ.τ.λ. form a *climax*. — εἰδότες] *since ye know* (comp. Rom. v. 3; 2 Cor. i. 7, iv. 14); it introduces the motive, so significant in this connection, to follow the περισσ. ἐν τ. ἐ. τ. κ.; ὁ κόπος ὑμῶν, *your painstaking labour*, which is devoted to the ἔργον τ. κυρίου. — κενός] *in vain, i.e. without result*. Comp. ver. 10; 1 Thess. iii. 5. So would the labour be, if there were no resurrection and no victorious consummation of eternal life, because then the blessed reward of the labour would remain unattained, namely, the salvation of the Messianic kingdom which is des-

tined for the labourer. Rom. ii. 7; 2 Tim. ii. 12; Jas. i. 12, *al.* — ἐν κυρίῳ] is not to be connected with ὁ κόπος ὑμ., but with οὐκ ἔστι κενός. It depends upon Christ, that your labour is not fruitless; for in Him the resurrection (ver. 22) and the Messianic σωτηρία have their causal basis, vv. 17–19; Acts iv. 12; Rom. v. 9 f., vi. 22, 23, x. 9, *al.*

NOTES BY AMERICAN EDITOR.

(o²) “*Saved if you hold fast.*” Ver. 2.

The view which reads, “I make known . . . if you still hold fast” is favoured by Principal Brown and is adopted in the text of the Revision of 1881, the other view being put in the margin, which, however, the American Committee prefer to the text. The weight of the argument appears to be with the old version. The force of the last clause of the verse is well given by Hodge thus: “the gospel secures salvation unless your faith is of no account.”

(p²) “*That Christ died for our sins.*” Ver. 3.

The Apostle begins the account of his Gospel not with the birth or infancy of Christ, but with his death. This is due not to the subject he was about to treat, so much as to his general custom of making the crucifixion the first and great theme of his preaching. (See i. 18, 23, ii. 2.) This agrees with the general strain of the Epistles, in which the death and resurrection of our Lord are the main points insisted upon. Rom. iv. 25; Ephes. i. 7–23; Col. i. 14–23; 1. Tim. iii. 16.

(q²) “*If so be that the dead are not raised.*” Ver. 15.

The principle assumed by the objectors was that the dead could not rise. Hence the reply of the Apostle is, If the dead cannot rise, then Christ did not rise; for Christ was dead.

(r²) “*We are of all men most miserable.*” Ver. 19.

This is not meant to teach that Christians in this life are more wretched than other men, for the contrary is the case. But the point is that Christ is all in all to His people, the source of their present as well as of their future happiness. Without Him they are yet in their sins, under the curse of the law, unreconciled to God, having no hope, and without God in the world; and yet subject to all the peculiar trials incident to the Christian profession which in the apostolic age often included the loss of all things.

The argument of vv. 14–19 may be summed up thus: If Christ’s resurrection be denied, (1) the whole gospel is subverted, v. 14; (2) the apostles are made false witnesses, v. 15; (3) believers, instead of being pardoned, are still in their sins, v. 17; (4) all the dead in Christ are lost, v. 18; and (5) the living are more miserable than other men, v. 19.

(s²) “*In Christ shall all be made alive.*” Ver. 22.

Alford and the Speaker’s Commentary agree with Meyer in taking the “all” as meaning the entire race, and confining the “making alive” to the mere fact

of a resurrection, without saying to what. But Stanley, Hodge, Prin. Brown, and Beet limit the "all" to those who are in Christ, *i.e.* believers, and give the verb its full meaning of a resurrection unto life. The wicked are not thought of at all by the Apostle, and there is no reference to them here. The latter view seems more in accordance with all that follows to the end of the chapter.

(τ^2) "*They that are Christ's.*" Ver. 23.

This phrase is used, Gal. v. 24, as = believers. It is difficult to see any reason why it may not be taken to denote those who belong to Christ, no matter in what age or country they may have lived.

(υ^2) "*Then cometh the end.*" Ver. 24.

The opinion which regards this phrase as meaning the end of the world is favoured by the natural meaning of the word, by the analogy of Scripture (Matt. xxiv. 6, 1. Peter iv. 7), and by the immediate connection which treats of the completion of Christ's mediatorial reign. So Stanley, Alford, Hodge, Principal Brown, Beet, etc. Meyer's view is rejected by most interpreters.

(ν^2) "*All his enemies.*" Ver. 25.

The next verse seems to show clearly that the "enemies" here refer not only to intelligent beings hostile to Christ, but to all forms of evil, physical or moral.

(w^2) "*The last enemy.*" Ver. 26.

This rendering of Meyer seems to give the sense better than the A. V. or the Revised Version. Beet translates in much the same way, "As a last enemy Death is brought to nought."

(x^2) "*All in all.*" Ver. 28.)

The phrase may be taken as *all things in all persons*, *i.e.* according to the connection, the one Being who fills up the whole place in each one's life, and is the sole ruler of all interests and events. To attach to it a pantheistic sense is utterly unreasonable and unscriptural. Stanley's note on the verse is suggestive.

(y^2) "*Baptized for the dead.*" Ver. 29.

All that needs to be added to the thorough discussion of these words in the text is the remark of Hodge. "The darkness which rests upon this passage can never be entirely cleared away, because the reference is to a custom of which no account is extant."

(z^2) "*Is not quickened except it die.*" Ver. 36.

The argument is that death is not annihilation, but disorganization, and this as preparatory to reorganization, so that there is merely a transition from one mode of being to another. But it is sometimes objected that while in the case of the seed the germ remains, so that there is no interruption in the organic life of the plant, the body on the contrary not only decays but is dis-

persed, its elements often being taken up into new combinations. The answer is that the life of the body may be in the soul, which at the proper time gathers its materials and unfolds itself into a new body. It is certain that sameness does not require absolute identity of materials. No full-grown man now has a particle of what constituted his body when a child, yet he is sure of his personal identity. So will it be with the risen saints. They will know themselves to be the same persons that died and were buried, and this is enough to sustain the blessed doctrine of the resurrection. To deny that doctrine because we are unable to explain it would be the height of folly.

(A³) “ *We shall also bear.*” Ver. 49.

All the recent editors adopt the subjunctive reading, and render *Let us also bear* as in the margin of the Revision of 1881, and for this the external evidence greatly preponderates. Yet this seems to be a case in which the demands of the context outweigh all other considerations. Stanley and Beet do not feel this, yet it would seem to be plain that Paul here is dealing not with ethics but physiology. Besides, Meyer, in his textual notes prefixed to the chapter, shows very clearly how the vicious reading may have originated.

(B³) “ *We shall not all sleep.*” Ver. 51.

Dr. Meyer seems to understand the Apostle as affirming a confident expectation that he and others of that generation would survive till the coming of Christ. To this there are two objections. First, it is not necessary. The words simply mean that all (including both the Apostle and his readers) will not die, but while some will escape death, none will escape a total bodily change. Secondly, to suppose that the Apostle solemnly, under divine direction, announced to his readers what was not the fact, would be to impeach his inspiration.

(C³) “ *We shall be changed.*” Ver. 51.

The author's assumption that the Apostle here states his belief that he should live to see the Parousia is not necessary, since the words may mean merely “all of us who are alive shall be changed,” and besides is opposed to his own statement to the Thessalonians (II. iv. 15), whom he warns against expecting a speedy occurrence of the Advent.

(D³) “ *Therefore be ye stedfast.*” Ver. 58.

The sudden subsidence of so impassioned a strain of triumph into so sober a conclusion is a remarkable instance of the practical character of the New Testament teaching (Stanley).

CHAPTER XVI.

Ver. 2. *σαββάτον*] recommended by Griesb., adopted also by Lachm. Rück. Tisch., following A B C D E F G J *Σ*** 17, Syr. Vulg. Chrys., *al.* Elz. and Scholz, however, have *σαββάτων*, an alteration in accordance with passages such as Matt. xxviii. 1; Mark xvi. 2; Luke xxiv. 1. — Ver. 7. Instead of the second *γάρ*, Elzevir has *δέ*, against decisive evidence. An alteration to express the antithesis. — *ἐπιτρέπη*] Lachm. Rück. Tisch. read, as approved previously by Griesb.: *ἐπιτρέψη*, following A B C J *Σ*, min. Chrys. Theoph. ms. Rightly; comp. Heb. vi. 3. — Ver. 17. *ὑμῶν*] *ὑμέτερον* should be adopted, according to preponderant evidence; and comp. Phil. ii. 30. — Instead of *οὔτοι*, A D E F G, 64, Vulg. Chrys. Oec. Ambrosiast. have *αὐτοί*, which is recommended by Griesb. and adopted by Lachm. Rück. Tisch. Rightly; the external evidence is considerable enough, and *οὔτοι* might easily be written on the margin by way of gloss. — Ver. 19. In place of *Πρίσκιλλα* we should write *Πρίσκα*, with Tisch., following B *Σ*, 17, and several vss. Pel. The former name was taken from the Acts. — Ver. 22. *Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν* in Elz. after *κύριον* (against A B C* *Σ** and several min. Aeth. Copt.) is an old, readily-occurring addition.

Vv. 1–9. *Regarding the collection* for Jerusalem; doubtless (comp. vii. 1, viii. 2, xii. 1) occasioned by a question in the Corinthian letter.

Ver. 1. The construction may be: *ὥπερ περὶ τῆς λογ. διέτ. ταῖς ἐκκλ. τῆς Γαλ., οὕτω κ.τ.λ.* Comp. 2 Cor. ix. 1; also 1 Cor. xii. 1. Still *περὶ . . . ἁγίους* may also be taken *by itself* (de Wette and others), comp. ver. 12, vii. 1, viii. 1. We cannot, indeed, decide, but the latter is more in harmony with the inartificial movement of the epistolary style. — *λογία συλλογῇ*, Suidas, comp. Hesychius. Without example elsewhere save in the Fathers. — *εἰς τοὺς ἁγίους*] *i.e.* *εἰς τοὺς πτωχοὺς τῶν ἁγίων τῶν ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ*, Rom. xv. 26. This detail, however, was obvious of itself to the readers; the assumption that *οἱ ἅγιοι* by itself denoted the *mother church* (Hofmann)¹ is neither necessary nor capable of proof; they are the *ἅγιοι who are known*; the readers were acquainted with the fact, for *whom* the apostle made the collection. — The *poverty* of the church at Jerusalem explains itself in part from the community of goods which had formerly² subsisted there (see on Acts ii. 44 f.). This poverty itself, along with the high interest excited by what was in truth the mother church of the whole of Christendom, as well as Gal. ii. 10, and generally Paul's love for his people (Rom. ix. 3), which made sacrifices with joy, form a sufficient explanation of his great zeal in their support, and of his delivering over the sums raised in person, notwith-

¹ See in opposition to this explanation of *οἱ ἅγιοι*, which was previously proposed by Wieseler also, Riehm, *Lehrbegr. d. Hebr. Br.* p. xviii. ed. 2.

² The community of goods cannot by this time have subsisted any longer; otherwise it could not have been said, Rom. *l.c.*, *τοὺς πτωχοὺς τῶν ἁγίων*. See Acts iv. 34.

standing the dangers which he saw before him. Rückert's view (comp. also Olshausen), that Paul desired to appease the minds of the Jewish Christians there which were embittered against him, before he journeyed into the west, has no trace whatever of its existence either in the Acts or the Epistles. See, on the contrary, Acts xxi. 17-24. Rückert even asserts that such a reason alone could justify him in undertaking so perilous a journey. But see Acts xx. 22-24. — τῆς Γαλατ.] whether from Ephesus by messengers, or in person on the journey mentioned in Acts xviii. 23 (Osiander, Neander, Wieseler), or by letter (so Ewald), must be left undecided. In the Epistle to the Galatians preserved to us there is no mention of this collection; for Gal. ii. 10 is of *general* import, although it is the basis of the apostolic διατάσσειν, as well as the special warrant for it. For the rest, Bengel aptly says: "Galatarum exemplum Corinthiis, Corinthiorum exemplum Macedonibus, et Macedonum Romanis proponit, 2 Cor. ix. 2; Rom. xv. 26. Magna exemplorum vis." But a proof, too, how Paul sought to foster the *community* of life and effort in his churches (comp. Lechler, p. 364 f.), and how the appointed *mode* of doing so had already approved itself.

Ver. 2. Κατὰ μίαν σαββάτον] *on each first day of the week*. A Hebraism very common in the New Testament, in accordance with the Jewish custom of designating the days of the week by *אָחֵר בַּשָּׁבַת*, *שְׁנֵי בַשָּׁבַת*, etc. Lightfoot, *Hor. ad Matth.* xxviii. 1. (E³) The *singular* of σαββ. also means *week*, as in Mark xvi. 9; Luke xviii. 12. — It does not, indeed, follow from this passage in itself that the Sunday was already observed at that time by assemblies for the worship of God, although this is to be assumed from other indications (see regarding this on Acts xx. 7); for παρ' ἐαυτῷ τιθέτω cannot refer to the laying down of money in the assembly (Estius, Bengel, Mosheim, *al.*); but no doubt it does show that to the Christian consciousness it was a holy day in whose consecration the appropriateness of such works of love was felt, τὰ γὰρ ἀπόρρητα ἀγαθὰ καὶ ἡ ῥίζα καὶ ἡ ἀρχὴ τῆς ζωῆς ἡμετέρας ἐν ταύτῃ γέγονεν, Chrysostom. — παρ' ἐαυτῷ τιθέτω κ.τ.λ.] *let him lay up in store at home whatever* (quodcunque) *he succeeds in*, i.e. if he has success in anything, let him lay it up (i.e. *what has been gained thereby*), comp. expressions such as in John xii. 5; Matt. xix. 21, etc. Comp. Herod. vi. 73: Κλεομένει εὐωδόθη τὸ πρῆγμα. Eccles. xi. 16, xxxviii. 14, xli. 1; Tobit iv. 19; 3 John 2. To supply *θησαυρίζειν* after εὐοδ. (Hofmann) is superfluous. Explanations such as *quod ei placuerit* (Vulgate,¹ Erasmus, *Paraphr.*, Luther, *al.*), and that of Billroth and Rückert, following older interpreters: *what is possible for him without burdening himself*, are not in accordance with the literal sense of εὐοδόω (see on Rom. i. 10). παρ' ἐαυτῷ: *at home, chez lui*, see on Luke xxiv. 12. Loesner, *Obs.* p. 297. *θησαυρίζων*: "paulatim cumulum aliquem faciens," Grotius. — ἵνα μὴ κ.τ.λ.] *in order that gatherings be not made, when I shall have come*. The collection was to be then so far already *made*, that every one would only have to produce what he had

¹ The Vulgate, perhaps, may have read εὐδοκῆ. Comp. the Gothic: "thatei vili" (what he will).

already gathered together week by week out of his profits in trade. By this whole injunction Paul doubtless had in view both the enlargement and the acceleration in due season of the collection.

Ver. 3. Οὓς ἐὰν δοκιμ.] *whomsoever you shall consider fit.* Paul thus makes the appointment of the persons who were to bring the money dependent upon the choice of his *readers*; hence Grotius observes: “Vide, quomodo vir tantus nullam *suspicioni* rimam aperire voluerit.” It is possible, however, that he had never thought of that; for it was quite natural for him, with his fine practical tact, not to anticipate the givers as respects the transmission of their gifts. — δι’ ἐπιστολῶν] *by means of letters*, by my giving them letters along with them to express their mission. Comp. Winer, p. 356 [E. T. 476]. The *plural* might denote the category (by way of letter), and thus only one letter be meant (Heumann); but there is nothing to *compel* us to depart from the plural sense, for Paul very reasonably might design to write different letters to *several* persons at Jerusalem.¹ Δι’ ἐπιστ. is to be connected with what follows (Chrysostom, Theophylact, and the majority of modern expositors), and it is *put first*, because Paul has already in his mind the other possible alternative, that *he himself* may make the journey. The majority of the older editors (except Er. Schmid), also Beza, Calvin, Estius, *al.*, connect it with δοκιμ: “quos Hierosolymitanis per epistolas commendaveritis,” Wetstein. But in that case the πέμψω would surely be somewhat meaningless! No; the *bearers* of the collection are to be chosen by the *givers*; but it is Paul, as the originator and apostolically commissioned steward (Gal. ii. 10) of the collection, who *sends* the money. — τὴν χάριν ὑμ.] *your love-gift, beneficium.* Comp. 2 Cor. viii. 4, 6, 7, 19. “Gratiosa appellatio,” Bengel; comp. Oecumenius; Xen. *Ag.* iv. 4 f., *Hier.* viii. 4; Eccles. iii. 29, xxx. 6, xxix. 15; 4 Macc. v. 8.

Ver. 4. *In case, however, of it* (what is being spoken of, *i.e.* the result of the collection) *being worthy that I too should journey* (to Jerusalem),² *then they shall journey with me.* The *genitive* τοῦ πορεύεσθαι depends upon ἄξιον. Comp. Fritzsche, *ad Matth.* p. 845; Winer, p. 304 [E. T. 408]. — Paul makes his own journeying thither dependent upon the issue of the collection, not, of course, for the sake of *safety* in its conveyance, nor yet because, in the event of a considerable sum being realized, he desired to be independent in connection with the *application* of it, but—which alone results from ἄξιον without arbitrariness—because a scanty sum would have been *dispro-*

¹ We see, too, from this passage how common it was for the apostle, in the course of his work, to indite letters even to individuals. Who knows how many of such writings of his have been lost! The only letter of the kind which we still have (setting aside the pastoral Epistles), that to Philemon, owes its preservation perhaps solely to the circumstance that it was addressed at the same time to the *church* in the house (Philem. 2).

² It is clear from καὶ ἐν πορ. that he will

not make the journey *at any rate* (Hofmann), but that he makes it dependent on the above-named circumstance whether *he also* shall journey thither. What a strange state of things, too, would be the result, if he were resolved to journey *at any rate*, but the messengers, in the event of the collection proving a small one, were to make the journey not in his company, but *alone*! Paul assuredly did not contemplate anything so paltry.

portionate to an extraordinary mission. Consideration for the decorum attaching to the apostolic rank underlies his procedure, not the prudential motive : "in order, on this opportunity, to fulfil his purpose of going to Jerusalem (Acts xix. 21), and to prepare for himself there a good reception" (de Wette), or in order by this journey to heal the breach between the Jewish and Gentile Christians (Baur). Bengel says well : "Justa aestimatio sui non est superbia." At the same time, he will not undertake this charge *alone* ; see 2 Cor. viii. 20.

Ver. 5 f. His arrival, which had not hitherto been specifically determined, is now defined by him as respects its time. — ὅταν Μακεδ. διέλθω] According to 2 Cor. i. 15, it had previously been his plan to proceed from Ephesus by Corinth to Macedonia, from Macedonia again back to Corinth, and then onward to Jerusalem. This plan, however, he has altered (see 2 Cor. i. 15, 23 ff.), and he now intends to journey first through Macedonia, and then to Corinth, where he thinks perhaps (τυχόν) to spend some time, or even to winter. In the second Epistle, too, we see him actually engaged on this journey in Macedonia (2 Cor. ii. 13, viii. 1, ix. 2, 4), and upon the way to Corinth (ii. 1, xii. 14, xiii. 1, *al.*). Acts xx. 1, 2, agrees with this. — Μακεδ. γὰρ διέρχ.] is not a parenthesis, but the Μακεδ. put first corresponds to the πρὸς ὑμᾶς δέ which follows, and the διέρχομαι to the παραμενῶ : *for Macedonia I journey through* (without halting), *but with you will I perhaps remain.* The present διέρχ. designates the future as present in conception, *i.e.* conceived as quite certain.¹ From the erroneous rendering : *I am on my journey through Macedonia*, arose the erroneous statement in the subscription, that the letter was written from Philippi. — παραμενῶ] he remained three months, Acts xx. 2. — ἵνα ὑμεῖς κ.τ.λ.] ὑμεῖς has the emphasis. Were Paul to remain in another church, others would give him the escort ; there is something kindly both in ἵνα and in ὑμεῖς, the unprompted thoughtfulness of love. — τυχόν] *forsan*, only here in the New Testament, very common in Greek writers. — οὖ] As Luke x. 1. Bornemann, *Schol. in loc.* ; Kühner, II. p. 313. Whither his thoughts, however, were *generally* turned at that time, see Acts xix. 21.

Ver. 7. *For it is not my will to see you now in passing.* Since he does not say πάλιν ἐν παρ., but ἄρτι ἐν παρ., no inference can be drawn from this passage to decide the question (see introduction to 2 Cor. § 2) whether Paul had been already *twice* in Corinth before writing our Epistle to the Corinthians (in opposition to Schrader, Neander, Wieseler, Otto) ; but he says simply : *it is not his will now to visit the Corinthians only as a passing traveller*, which leaves it quite undecided whether he has already previously visited them once ἐν παρόδῳ (so, too, Hofmann) or not. In order rightly to understand the passage, observe that the ὑμᾶς, which is put first on that account, has the emphasis, in contrast to the Macedonians. The *Corinthians*, in the journey which he is now about to make, are to have the advantage over the Macedonians, whom he will only see in *journeying through*, ver. 5.² Ac-

¹ [That is, *I am to pass*, not *I am passing*, a sense of the present tense not uncommon in the New Testament.—T. W. C.]

² This also against Otto, *Pastoralb.* p. 256 f.

according to Billroth and others, the thought is meant to be, that he will not now see them, *as he had formerly intended*, on his journey through (to Macedonia). But in that case he would have written : ἄρτι γὰρ οὐ θέλω κ.τ.λ. Regarding ἐν παρόδῳ, comp. Thuc. i. 126. 7, v. 4. 5, vii. 2. 3 ; Polyb. v. 68. 8 ; Lucian, *D. Deor.* xxiv. 2. — ἐλπίζω γὰρ κ.τ.λ.] ground of the οὐ θέλω κ.τ.λ. ; for he hopes that the Lord will enable him to make a longer visit to the church than merely ἐν παρόδῳ, and upon the ground of this hope it is not his will, etc. — ὁ κύριος] *Christ*, in whose service the apostle journeys and works (Acts xvi. 7, 10). — ἐπιτρέψῃ] *shall have allowed*, i.e. shall have given signs of His approval. “*Pia conditio*,” Bengel. Comp. iv. 19.

Vv. 8, 9. Paul now mentions the duration of his present stay in Ephesus, and the reason of it. — τῆς πεντηκ.] is the immediately impending festival of Pentecost. See Introduction, § 3. Nothing can be inferred from our text, which contains simply a statement of time, in support of a *Christian* celebration of this festival as already by this time subsisting. — θύρα γὰρ μοι κ.τ.λ.] The figurative expression (comp. Wetstein) denotes *the opportunity opened before him for working* (otherwise Acts xiv. 27). Comp. 2 Cor. ii. 12, and see on Col. iv. 3. (F³) Μεγάλη applies to the *extent*, ἐνεργ. to the *influence* of the sphere of action offered ; the latter epithet, however, *powerful*, corresponds not to the *figure* but to the *matter*, and even to that only in so far as it is conceived of as immediately *connected* with the opened θύρα,—a want of congruity in the animated and versatile mode of representation (comp. Plato, *Phaedr.* p. 245 A : Μουσῶν ἐπὶ ποιητικὰς θύρας ἀφίκηται) which occasioned the reading ἐναργής, *evidens* (Vulgate, Itala, Pelagius, Ambrosiaster, Beda), which occurs in Philem. 6, and is approved by Beza, Grotius, Bos, and Clericus. As regards the later Greek of ἀνέωγεν (instead of ἀνέωκται, as 46, Theophylact and Oecumenius actually read), see Lobeck, *ad Phrygn.* p. 157 f. — κ. ἀντικείμε. πολλοί] “*quibus resistam*. Saepe bonum et contra ea malum simul valde vigent,” Bengel.

Vv. 10, 11. Recommendation of Timothy (iv. 17) to be well received and escorted back. He is not the bearer of our Epistle (Bleek), but journeyed through Macedonia (Acts xix. 22), and must arrive in Corinth later than the Epistle. — ἐὰν δὲ ἔλθῃ] *if, indeed, he shall have come*. Rückert holds that ὅταν would have been more correct. Either one or other was correct, just according to the conception of the writer. He conceives of the arrival of Timothy as conditioned by the circumstances, and therefore places it under the hypothetical, not under the temporal (ὅταν), point of view.—ἵνα κ.τ.λ.] design of the βλέπετε : be careful, *in order that he*, etc. Paul might also have written negatively : βλέπετε, μὴ ἐν φόβῳ (ii. 3), or ἵνα μὴ ἐ. φό. (2 John 8), etc. The positive expression, however, demands more ; his *going out and in* among the readers is to be *free from fear*. Comp. on γίνεσθαι with the adverb of the mode of the going out and in, Herod. i. 8, ix. 109 ; Plut. *Alex.* 69, *Demetr.* 11, *Mor.* p. 127 A ; also Plato, *Prot.* 325 B ; Tobit vii. 9, 11 ; 1 Macc. viii. 29. They are so to conduct themselves towards him that he shall not be *intimidated* among them. This peculiar ἀφόβως, as well as the reason assigned which follows τὸ γὰρ ἔργον κ.τ.λ., and the conclusion again drawn from it : μή τις οὖν αὐτ. ἐξουθενήσῃ, make it probable

that Paul has in view not the *ill-will of his own opponents*, which his friend might encounter (Osiander, Neander), with which the τὸ γὰρ . . . ὥς καὶ ἐγὼ does not well agree, but the *youth* of Timothy (1 Tim. iv. 12), on account of which, in a church to some extent of a high-minded tendency, he might easily be not held in full respect, slighted and intimidated. So already Chrysostom and the majority of interpreters. The conjecture that Timothy was of a timid *nature* (de Wette) is without a trace of historical support, and is superfluous. Regarding τὸ ἔργ. τοῦ κυρ., see on xv. 58. — ἐν εἰρήνῃ] is not to be explained from the formula : πορεύεσθαι ἐν εἰρήνῃ (so Calvin : “salvum ab omni noxa,” comp. Beza, Flatt, Maier), since, on the contrary, the context would lead us to think, in accordance with ἀφόβως and μὴ τις ἐξουθ., of a *peaceful* escort, a προπέμπειν *in peace and concord*, χωρὶς μάχης κ. φιλονεικίας (Chrysostom, Theophylact). Flatt and Hofmann refer ἐν εἰρ. to *what follows* (that he may come to me safely and without danger). But the subsequent reason assigned contains nothing referable to ἐν εἰρήνῃ, which must have been the case, had it been so emphatically put first. Besides, the escort to be given was not for protection, but in testimony of love and reverence. — ἵνα ἔλθῃ πρὸς με] There is implied, namely, in προπέμψατε κ.τ.λ., with its aim as here defined : “in order that he may come (back) to me,” the admonition *not to detain him too long in Corinth*—for Paul is *expecting* him. — μετὰ τῶν ἀδελφῶν] Several others, therefore, besides Erastus (Acts xix. 22), had journeyed with Timothy.¹

Ver. 12. Δέ] marks the transition from Timothy to Apollos. — περὶ δὲ Ἀπ. τοῦ ἀδ.] stands independently : *quod attinet ad Apoll.*, as ver. 1, vii. 1. — ἵνα ἔλθῃ κ.τ.λ.] design of the πολλὰ παρεκάλεσα αὐτόν : *I have advised him much, in order that he should come*, etc. Paul makes this remark : “ne Corinthii suspicentur, ab eo fuisse impeditum,” Calvin. Perhaps they had expressly besought that Apollos might be sent to them. — πολλά is *intensive*, as in ver. 19, and often in Greek writers. — μετὰ τῶν ἀδελφῶν] These are the Corinthian Christians, who journeyed back from Ephesus to Corinth with this Epistle. See ver. 17. Here also the words are not to be joined with παρεκάλεσα (Hofmann), but with ἵνα ἔλθῃ κ.τ.λ., beside which they stand. — καὶ πάντως κ.τ.λ.] *And the will was wholly* (out and out) *lacking* (“sermo quasi impersonalis,” Bengel) *that he should come now*, comp. Matt. xviii. 14. The context compels us to understand θέλημα of the will of Apollos, not of God’s will (Theodoret, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Bengel, Rückert). καὶ does not stand for ἀλλά (Beza and others) comp. Rom. 1. 13. — ὅταν εὐκαιρ.] *So soon as he shall have found a convenient time* for it. Regarding the lateness of the word in Greek, see Lobeck, *ad Phryn.* p. 125.

REMARK.—It follows from this passage that Apollos, who by this time must have been again (Acts xviii. 24 ff.) in Ephesus,² was neither a faction-maker

¹ To refer it to ἐκδέχ. : *I with the brethren* who are here (Bengel and de Wette undecidedly, older interpreters in Calovius, and again Hofmann), has the analogy of ver. 12 against it. It was usual that several should

be sent together on such missions.

² He seems, however, just when this letter was written to have been absent for a time, since no special greeting is sent from him.

nor at variance with Paul, for Paul himself plainly regarded his going to Corinth as a thing advantageous and to be desired. Hence, too, the refusal of Apollos is not to be explained from fear of adding new fuel to the party heats, but simply from the contents of the *ὅταν εὐκαιρήσῃ*. He must have found hindrances for the present in the relations of his work, by which he saw himself detained from the desired journey until a more convenient time, so that he did not yield even to the advice of the apostle. The text tells us nothing further ; but the Corinthians themselves might learn more details from the bearers of the Epistle. Van Hengel (*Gave d. talen.* p. 111 f.) brings the refusal into a too arbitrarily assumed connection with the Corinthian misuse of the glossolalia.

Ver. 13 f. In conclusion of the whole Epistle, and without connection or reference to what has immediately preceded, there is now added a concise exhortation which compresses closely together, in five imperatives following each other asyndetically, the whole sum of the Christian calling, upon which are then to follow some personal commendations and greetings, as well as, lastly, the proper closing greeting and the benediction. — The *γρηγορεῖτε* summons to Christian *foresight and soberness*, without which steadfastness in the faith (*στήκ. ἐν τ. πίστ.*) is not possible ; (*α³*) *ἀνδρίζεσθε* and *κραταιοῦσθε*, again, to the manly (“*muliebris enim omnis inconstantia*,” Pelagius) and vigorous resistance against all dangers, without which that steadfastness cannot continue. — *ἀνδρίζεσθαι*] *to bear oneself manfully*, to be manly in bearing and action ; only here in the New Testament, but often in classic writers, see Wetstein, and in the LXX. Comp. the Homeric *ἀνέρες ἐστε*, *Il.* v. 529 ; and see, also, Valckenaer, *ad Herod.* vii. 210 ; Heind. *ad Plat. Phædr.* p. 239 B. Comp. *ἀνδρικῶς ὑπομεῖναι μάχεσθαι κ.τ.λ.*, Ast, *Lex. Plat.* I. p. 165. — *κραταιοῦσθε*] *be strong*. Comp. Eph. iii. 16: *δυνάμει κραταιωθῆναι διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸν ἔσω ἄνθρωπον*. The verbal form occurs in the LXX. and Apocrypha ; not in Greek writers, who say *κρατύνεσθαι*. — *ἐν ἀγάπῃ*] as in the life-sphere of the whole Christian disposition and action, chap. xiii., and, in particular, of mutual edification, viii. 1.

Vv. 15–18. Commendation of the three Corinthian delegates who had brought to the apostle the letter of the church ; first of all (ver. 15 f.) and chiefly, of *Stephanas* (i. 16) and his house. The special expression which Paul gives (ver. 16) to the commendation of Stephanas must have been grounded in some antagonism unknown to us, which the man had to lament in his work for the church. — *παρακαλῶ*] The question is, Whether the exhortation itself begins at once with *οἶδατε* (so that the latter would be *imperative*), or only with *ἵνα*, so that *οἶδατε* would be *indicative*, and the passage ending with *ἐαυτούς* would put forward the motive in the first place ? The latter is the *ordinary* view and the only *correct* one, for *οἶδατε* as an *imperative* form (instead of *ἴστε*) cannot be pointed out (in opposition to Erasmus, Wolf, Heydenreich) ; on the supposition of its being *imperative*, *εἰδέναι* would require to be taken as in 1 Thess. v. 12 (“*ut jubeat agnoscere bene meritos*,” Erasmus) ; on the view of its being *indicative*, it is the simple *know*. The construction is the ordinary attraction *οἶδά σε τίς εἶ*, and *οἶδατε . . . ἐαυτούς* is an auxiliary thought which interrupts the construction (comp. Dissen, *ad Dem. de Cor.* p. 34 b). — *ἀπαρχὴ τῆς Ἀχ.*] *i.e.* the first family which

had accepted Christianity in Achaia ; the holy *first-fruits* of the land, in so far as it was destined to become, and was in process of becoming, *Christian*. Comp. Rom. xv. 6. — ἔταξαν] The *plural*, on account of the collective οἰκία. *They have set themselves* (voluntarily devoted themselves and placed themselves at the post) *for the service of the saints*. Instances of τάσσειν ἑαυτὸν in this sense may be seen in Wetstein and Kypke, II. p. 234. Comp. Plato, *Rep.* p. 371 C : ἑαυτοὺς ἐπὶ τὴν διακονίαν τάττουσι ταύτην, Xen. *Ages.* ii. 25, *Mem.* ii. 1. 11. Beza denies the emphasis of ἑαυτούς, unwarrantably, but in the interest of the “*vocatio legitima*.”¹ We have no more precise knowledge of the historical circumstances here pointed to. Perhaps Stephanas devoted himself also especially to journeys, embassies, execution of special commissions, and the like ; his wife, to the care of the poor and sick. — τοῖς ἀγίοις is an appropriating dative to διακ. See, already, Raphel, *Xenoph. in loc.* ; Bernhardt, p. 88. By οἱ ἄγιοι are meant *the Christians*, as in ver. 1 ; not, however, the *mother church at Jerusalem* (Hofmann). A reference to prosecuting the collection (in connection with which people had, it is supposed, been refractory towards Stephanas) lies wholly remote from the words. — καὶ ὑμεῖς] *You too*. The καὶ finds its reference, according to the context, in what goes before : εἰς διακ. τ. ἀγ. ἔταξ. ἑαυτ. Wetstein is right, therefore, in saying : “*illi vobis ministrant ; aequum est, ut vos illis vicissim honorem exhibeatis*” (rather : *obsequamini*). — ὑποτάσσ.] namely, to their proposals, exhortations, etc. Ewald and Ritschl regard Stephanas as one of the *overseers* of the church ; a relation which, however, would have required a more precise and definite designation than the general and qualitative τοῖς τοιούτοις. See, besides, on i. 17. — τοῖς τοιούτοις] *to those who are so affected*, indicates, in a generalizing way, the *category* to which Stephanas and his house belong. This generalization, by which the injunction of obedience towards the concrete persons comes out in a less strict and immediate form, but in which it is still implied, is a *delicacy* of expression. — τῷ συνεργ.] The reference of the συν is given by the context from τοῖς τοιούτοις ; hence : *who works with them*, i.e. *in fellowship with them*, which presupposes harmony in the spirit and purport of the work. Comp. Chrysostom. While Rückert leaves us our choice between three supplements contrary to the context : τῷ θεῷ (iv. 9), ἐμοί (so Erasmus), and ὑμῖν (2 Cor. i. 24), Hofmann adds a fourth arbitrary supplement : *helpful to increase the kingdom of God*. This *design* is of course taken for granted of itself, but does not explain the συν. — καὶ κοπιῶντι] *and takes pains* (therein), gives himself trouble about it. Comp. xv. 10, iv. 12 ; Gal. iv. 11 ; Rom. xvi. 6.

Vv. 17, 18. Regarding *Fortunatus* (probably not different from the person named in Clem. 1 Cor. 59) and *Achaicus* no particulars are known. They are not to be included (as de Wette would have it) in the family of Stephanas, which has been spoken of already. Grotius holds them to be Chloe’s people ; but see on i. 11. — ὅτι τὸ ὑμέτερον ὑστέρημα αὐτοὶ ἀνεπλ.] *because they for their part have supplied your lack* (your absence). Comp. on Phil.

¹ Which does not come into consideration here, since there is no mention of entrance upon an ecclesiastical office.

ii. 30. Ὑμέτ. is thus taken *objectively* (comp. xv. 31) : *the lack of your presence* ; and ὑμέτ. and αὐτοί (see the critical remarks) have the emphasis. Observe how *courteously* the expression : *the want of you* (of your presence), is chosen. Hofmann, on the contrary, misses this delicate touch by taking it as : what was lacking *in you*, in this respect, namely, that you could not appear with me in person. With still less delicacy Grotius, who adduces in his support 2 Cor. ix. 12 : “*quod vos omnes facere oportuit, id illi fecerunt ; certio rem me fecere de vestris morbis.*” He is followed by Rückert, who founds wrongly upon Phil. ii. 30 : “*what should have been done by you, that have they done,*” inasmuch, namely, as they had given him joy, which had not been done by the Corinthians. But we must not decide here by passages from other Epistles, since linguistically both renderings alike may be correct, but simply by the connection, according to which the men as *ambassadors* from the Corinthians were the compensation to the apostle for the lack of the presence of the latter. Comp. Chrysostom. — ἀνέπανσαν γὰρ κ.τ.λ.] reason assigned for the preceding τὸ ὑστέρημα αὐτ. ἀνεπλ.¹ Regarding the phrase, comp. 2 Cor. vii. 13 ; Philem. 7, 20. — καὶ τὸ ὑμῶν] for they have refreshed (by their arrival here, and the communications and assurances connected therewith, comp. 2 Cor. vii. 13) my spirit *and yours*. The latter, inasmuch as they had come not in their own name, but as *representatives of the whole church* ; their meeting therefore with Paul could not but be refreshing to the consciousness of the whole church. As they by their presence provided for *Paul* the joy of ἀνάπανσις, so they provided it also for the *church*, which through them had entered into this fellowship with the apostle, and thus owed to them the refreshment which it could not but experience in the consciousness of this living intercourse of love with Paul brought about through these men. Comp. Chrysostom : οὐ Παύλῳ μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐκείνοις αὐτοὺς χαρισαμένους δείκνυσιν τῷ τὴν πόλιν ἅπασαν ἐν αὐτοῖς περιφέρειν. Paul thus expresses not simply *reciprocity* in general,—that which is *presupposed where there is good-will* (de Wette),—but the relation implied in the *representation* of the church by their delegates,—a relation, therefore, which for the latter, in virtue of their acceptance of the embassy, was one of *merit*. There lies here, also, in the addition of this second pronoun, a tender delicacy (comp. on i. 2), which the readers acquainted with the manner of the apostle could well appreciate. Grotius makes the reference to be to the assurances of Paul's love which those men had brought with them to the Corinthians. But τὸ ὑμῶν also, like τὸ ἐμὸν πνεῦμα, must refer to the time of the presence of the delegates with Paul. — ἐπιγινώσκετε] Attention to the compound verb : *recognize them rightly* (comp. on xiii. 12), should of itself have sufficed to prevent alterations of the sense of the word (such as : *prize them highly*, so Theophylact, Grotius, Flatt, Neander, and others). The high esteem is the *consequence* of the ἐπιγιν. — τοὺς τοιούτους] as in ver. 16.

Ver. 19 f. Τῆς Ἀσίας] in the narrower sense, comprehending the western coastlands of Asia Minor (see on Acts ii. 9), where Ephesus also lay. From

¹ Had Paul and his readers met together in person, this would have been refreshing for both parties (comp. Rom. i. 12) ; and

this refreshment of both parties had now taken place through those delegates.

the latter, at least, Paul was *charged* with a greeting, but in the assurance of a like loving fellowship on the part also of the other Asiatic churches, with which he was in intercourse from Ephesus, he *widens* it. — ἐν κυρίῳ] marks the *Christian* character of the greeting, inasmuch as it was given with the feeling of living and moving in Christ. Comp. on Rom. xvi. 22. The ἐν κυρ., which is here added, is taken for granted by the reader in the case of the other greetings also. But *here* precisely it is expressed, because this greeting is a specially *fervent* one ; hence also πολλά (*much*, comp. ver. 12). — σὺν τῇ κατ' οἶκον αὐτ. ἐκκλ.] Aquila and Prisca (Priscilla), who had gone from Corinth (see on Acts xviii. 2) to Ephesus (Acts xviii. 18, 26), had therefore given their dwelling here too, as afterwards at Rome (Rom. xvi. 3 f.), for the assembly of a portion of the Christians in the place. Comp. on Rom. *l.c.* Probably Paul also lodged with them, so that the old addition : παρ' οἷς καὶ ξενίζομαι (D E F G, Vulg., etc.), contains a true statement. — οἱ ἀδελφοὶ πάντες] the whole of the members of the Ephesian church—these, still, separately and personally, although already included collectively in the first greeting. — ἐν φιλ. ἀγ.] *by means of a holy kiss*. See on Rom. xvi. 16 ; 2 Cor. xiii. 12 ; 1 Thess. v. 26. It is the kiss which was the token of Christian, brotherly love (1 Pet. v. 14), and thus had the specific character of Christian consecration. Comp. *Constit. apost.* ii. 57. 12, viii. 5. 5 : τὸ ἐν κυρίῳ φίλημα. More special considerations, such as that of the *absence of hypocrisy* (Chrysostom, Theodoret, Theophylact), are *imported*. They are to greet *each other, mutually* (not from *Paul*), with the holy kiss after the reading of the Epistle in the assembly, and thereby manifest their brotherly love to each other respectively.¹ Comp. on Rom. xvi. 16.

Vv. 21-24. Conclusion added with his own hand in token, according to 2 Thess. iii. 17, comp. ii. 2, that the Epistle, though not written with his own hand, was *his* Epistle. Comp. Col. iv. 18. — ὁ ἀσπασμός] is the greeting κατ' ἐξοχήν, the final salutation to the church. Nothing is to be supplied ; on the contrary, Paul *writes* these words, and *there is* the greeting. — Παύλου] in apposition to ἐμῇ. See Kühner, II. p. 145. — In ver. 22, looking back once more, as it were involuntarily, upon the many degenerate forms of Christian life, and the discords at Corinth, he adds an apostolic utterance of judgment, full of terrible solemnity, against all those who could not but feel that it struck at them. — οὐ φιλεῖ τ. κύρ.] *is without love to Christ*. So he designates *those* Christians, who, like so many at Corinth, by factiousness, self-seeking, strife, a carnal life, etc., practically denied their love to Christ (John xiv. 23). That the course applied to them, *as long as they were impenitent*, is self-evident. Comp. 2 Cor. vii. 10.—Observe that the more sensuous word φιλεῖν is nowhere used by Paul in those Epistles which are undoubtedly his (comp., however, Tit. iii. 15), except in this passage so full of emotion ; elsewhere he uses ἀγαπᾶν (Eph. vi. 24). — ἤτω ἀνάθ.] *i.e. then let him be one devoted to destruction* (to the eternal ἀπώλεια). See on Rom. ix. 3 ; Gal. i. 8. — μαρναθά] energetic reference to the *Parousia*, at which that

¹ We are to conceive of this ἀσπάζεσθαι the medium instead of words. Comp. ἀλληλοῦς as a *silent* one, in which the kiss is. *Const. ap.* viii. 11. 4.

ἡτῶ ἀνάθ. shall be realized. The word is the Aramaic אֲנָתָא כְּרִיִּי, *i.e.* *our Lord is come*, by which, however, not the coming *in the flesh* is meant, as Chrysostom, Theodoret, Theophylact, Jerome, Erasmus, Castalio, *al.*, assume,¹ but, in accordance with the context (see previously ἡτῶ ἀνάθ.), the *eschatological* coming to judgment. Paul sees the near and certain Parousia as if already begun (see on this use of the Hebrew praeterite, Ewald, *Lehrb.* 135. 3), and exclaims, like a prophet beholding it in vision : *Our Lord is here!* But it is not a *form of putting under ban* (see Lighfoot, *Hor.* p. 260), as indeed it does not occur in the Rabbinical writings ; Luther (comp. Calvin) has without any warrant made it into *Maharam Motha* (which would be מְחָרֵם מוֹתָא, *maledictus ad mortem*). According to Hofmann, μαραναθά is meant to be equivalent to כִּי אַתָּה הוּא, *Thou art the Lord*, whereby the thought is expressed : “*He will prove Himself in them to be Lord.*” But how needless is this wholly novel and far less characteristic interpretation ! The traditional interpretation,² on the other hand, places the *punishment of the judgment* directly before our eyes. Why, we may ask further, did Paul use the *Aramaean* expression ? We do not know. (π³) Perhaps there was implied in it some reminiscence from the time of the apostle's presence among them, unknown to us, but carrying weight for his readers ; perhaps it was only the prompting of momentary indignation, that, after the sentence of judgment already pronounced (ἡτῶ ἀνάθεμα), “*rei gravitate commotus, quasi sibi non satisfacisset*” (Calvin), he desired to clothe in truly solemn language the threatening reference to the Parousia yet to be added by μαραναθά, instead of saying ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν ἥκει. That there was a reference, however, in the Aramaean expression to the *Petrine party* who understood Hebrew, is not to be assumed (in opposition to Hofmann), as the general εἰ τις οὐ φιλεῖ τ. κύριον shows of itself. The two Aramaean words were doubtless intelligible enough in general in the mixed church, which contained so much of the Jewish element. Had the *Maranatha*, however, been as it were the *mysterious watchword* in the world of that time (Ewald), there would be in all probability more traces of it to be found in the New Testament. This also in opposition to Bengel. The view of Chrysostom and Theophylact is singularly absurd : Paul wished by the Aramaean to cross the conceit of the Corinthians in the Hellenic language and wisdom. Billroth, followed by Rückert, holds that he had added something in Aramaic also, in order to accredit yet more strongly the authenticity of the Epistle, but that this had afterwards been written by the transcribers in Greek letters. But the assumption that

¹ Paul, they hold, means thereby to say : “*Quod superfluum sit adversus eum (Christum) odiis pertinacibus contendere, quem venisse jam constet,*” Jerome, *Ep.* 137 *ad Marcell.* ; or, he means thereby to put them to *shame*, because they still continued in their sins after the Lord had shown such condescension, Chrysostom ; or, “*quandoquidem aversatur eum, a quo solo poterat consequi salutem, et venisse negat quem constat venisse magno bono credentium,*

sed magno malo incredulorum,” Erasmus, *Paraphr.* ; or, “*quod si quis eum non amat, frustra alium expectat,*” Castalio.

² Even those codd. which have written the word in a divided way, have the division not μαρ αναθα, but μαραν αθα. So already B**. And the versions, too (those which do not with the Vulgate retain it untranslated), translate according to this division ; so already the Peshitto : *Dominus noster venit.* Cod. It. g. : *in adventu Domini.*

he had *not* written *μαρναθά* in Greek letters, although it has passed over so into all Greek mss. of the text, is equally arbitrary with the presupposition that he had thought such an *extraordinary* and *peculiar* mode of attestation to be needful precisely in the case of this Epistle, which was already sufficiently accredited without it by the bearers. — Ver. 23. *The grace of the Lord*, etc., *sc.* *εἰη*, the apostle's most common closing wish in an epistle, Rom. xvi. 20, 24 ; Gal. vi. 18 ; Phil. iv. 23 ; 1 Thess. v. 28 ; 2 Thess. iii. 18 ; Philem. 25. — Ver. 24. *My love*, etc., *sc.* *ἐστὶ* : his heart impels him still to add this assurance at the very end, all the more because the divisions, immoralities, and disorders in the church had forced from him such severe rebukes and, even now, such corrective appeals. He *loves* them, and loves them *all*. If taken as *optative* (Luther, Estius, Ewald), it would be less suitably an indirect admonition, namely, that they might so *conduct* themselves that, etc. — *ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ*] Christ is his whole life-sphere ; in it *he loves also*. His love has thus the distinctively Christian character, in contrast to all *κοσμικὴ ἀγάπη* (Theophylact).

NOTES BY AMERICAN EDITOR.

(E³) “ *The first day of the week.*” Ver. 2.

This is generally and justly considered the earliest mention of the observance of the Lord's day. It does not show that Sunday was then observed by assemblies for public worship, for the direction implies that the laying by of money for charity was to be done individually and in private. But it does show that the day then had a sacred character which made it eminently suitable for the discharge of a duty of Christian love. On no other ground can we account for the mention of a specific day by the Apostle. — It may be added that if it was intended, as some say, that the Old Testament obligation of contributing a tithe of one's gains should be continued in the New, here was a proper place to mention it.

(F³) “ *A great door and effectual,*” etc. Ver. 9.

Two inducements for the Apostle to stay in Ephesus are a wide sphere and a powerful opposition. As Grotius says, what terrifies others attracts Paul. His reference is, on one hand, to the spread of the Gospel in the neighbourhood of Ephesus (Acts xix. 20), and on the other, to the opposition of Pagan (xix. 23) and of Jewish (xix. 33, xx. 29) enemies (Stanley).

(G³) *Stand fast in the faith.* Ver. 13.

Hodge gives well a certain phase of this injunction : “ Do not consider every point of doctrine an open question. Matters of faith, doctrines for which you have a clear revelation of God, such for example as the doctrine of the resurrection, are to be considered settled, and as among Christians, no longer matters of dispute. There are doctrines embraced in the creeds of orthodox churches so clearly taught in Scripture that it is not only useless but hurtful to be always calling them into question.” — On the whole verse Beet remarks : “ Note the military tone of these words. We are sentinels on guard, and must not yield to sleep. In face of the enemy we must maintain our position ; and

we do so by abiding in faith. We must show moral courage. To this end we must accept the strength provided for us. This fourfold description of our attitude towards spiritual foes is followed by a description in one word of our attitude towards our fellow-Christians and fellow-men. Love must be the one element of our entire activity."

(H³) "*Anathema, Maran-atha.*" Ver. 22.

The introduction of the Aramaean phrase may best be explained as giving additional force to the previous curse, since such seems to be the origin of the use of the Syriac *Abba* in Rom. viii. 15, Gal. iv. 6, and of Hebrew words such as *Abaddon* and *Armageddon* in the Apocalypse. The assurance that "the Lord is coming" is a solemn reminder that the anathema is not an idle threat, but a tremendous reality. — It is vain to deny, as some do (Speaker's Com. *in loc.*), that this is an imprecation. The words can mean nothing else. The explanation is that they express no personal vindictiveness, but only the writer's absolute sympathy with all holy beings in their opposition to the crowning sin of men, viz. their insensibility or indifference to Him who unites in himself all divine and all human excellence, and who so loved our lost race as to stoop to the cross that we might not perish, but have everlasting life. They who refuse to recognize such love deserve to be *anathema*.

PREFACE

TO THE COMMENTARY ON THE SECOND EPISTLE.

SINCE the year 1862, in which the fourth edition of this Commentary was issued, the only exegetical work calling for mention on the Second Epistle to the Corinthians (except a Roman Catholic one) is that of von Hofmann. My relation to this work has already been indicated in the preface to the Commentary on the First Epistle ; it could not be different in the exposition of the Second, and it will doubtless remain unaltered as regards the Pauline writings that are still to follow, as is apparent already in the case of the Epistle to the Galatians, my exposition of which I likewise am now issuing in a new edition.

The much-discussed questions of Introduction—whether between our two Epistles to the Corinthians there intervened a letter which has been lost, and whether the adversaries so sharply portrayed and severely censured by the apostle in the Second Epistle belonged to the Christ-party—have recently been handled afresh in special treatises with critical skill and acumen ; and the general result, although with diversities in detail, points to an *affirmative* answer. After careful investigation I have found myself constrained to abide by the *negative* view ; and I must still, as regards the second question, hold the Christine party to be the most innocent of the four, so that they are wrongly, in my judgment, made responsible for all the evil which Paul asserts of his opponents in the Second Epistle. I am at a loss to know how so much that is bad can be brought into inward ethical connection with the simple confession $\epsilon\gamma\omega\ \delta\epsilon\ \chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\upsilon$ without calling in the aid of hypotheses incapable of being proved ; or how, moreover, Paul should not already in his First Epistle, which was followed up by the Second in the very same year, have discovered the thoroughly dangerous springs and movements of this party-tendency ; or lastly, and most of all, how Clement of Rome, while recalling to the recollection of his readers the three other factions, should not even in a single word have mentioned the Christ-party, although in looking back on the past he could not but have had before his eyes the whole historical development of the fourfold division, and in particular

the mischief for which the Christians were to blame, if there were in truth anything of the sort. I have not met with any real elucidation of these points among the acute supporters of the opposite view.

In wishing for this new edition a kindly circle of readers, not led astray either by the presupposition of the dogmatist or by the tendency to import and educe subjective ideas,—as I may be allowed to do all the more earnestly on account of the special difficulties that mark the present letter of the apostle,—I commit all work done for the science which applies itself soberly, faithfully, and devotedly to the service of the divine word—desiring and seeking nothing else than a sure historical understanding of that word—to the protection and the blessing of Him, who can do exceeding abundantly above all that we ask and understand. Under this protection we can do nothing against the truth, everything for the truth.

HANNOVER, *21st June*, 1870.

THE SECOND EPISTLE OF PAUL TO THE CORINTHIANS.

INTRODUCTION.

§ 1.—OCCASION, AIM, AND CONTENTS OF THE EPISTLE.¹

BEFORE the composition of our first Epistle, Paul had sent Timothy to Corinth (1 Cor. iv. 17) ; he assumed, in regard to him, that he would arrive there later than the Epistle (1 Cor. xvi. 10 f.), and he might therefore expect from him accounts of the impression which it made, and its result. Certainly Timothy is again with Paul, while he is composing the second Epistle (2 Cor. i. 1) ; but there is no mention of news brought by him. Hence Eichhorn was of opinion (also Rübiger and Hofmann) that he had again left Corinth even *before* the arrival of our first Epistle in that city ; others, however (Ziegler, Bertholdt, Neander, Credner, Rückert, de Wette, Reuss, Maier), assumed that he had *not* come to Corinth *at all*, but had returned from Macedonia, where he had made too long a stay, to Ephesus (Acts xix. 22).² But against the latter view may be urged the fact that, according to 1 Cor. iv. 17, Timothy was quite distinctly *delegated* to Corinth, *i.e.* was commissioned to visit Corinth from Macedonia (comp. Acts xix. 22) ; hence we are not justified in believing that he left this apostolic mission unfulfilled, or that Paul himself had cancelled it, otherwise we should necessarily expect the apostle in this second Epistle to have explained to his readers *why* Timothy did not come, especially as the anti-Pauline party would not have failed to turn the non-appearance of Timothy to account for their hostile ends (comp. i. 17). Eichhorn's opinion presupposes that the bearers of the first letter lingered on the journey (1 Cor. xvi. 17), which there is the less ground to assume as these men presumably had no other aim than to return from Ephesus to Corinth. In opposition to the opinions that Timothy

¹ See Klöpper, *Exeg. krit. Unters. üb. d. zweiten Brief. d. Paulus an d. Gemeinde zu Kor.*, Gött. 1869.

² Chap. xii. 17, 18 is also quoted in confirmation of this view ; for, it is said, if Timothy had come to Corinth, Paul could not but have mentioned him here. See espe-

cially, Rückert, p. 409. But Paul may, during the time when he was not at Corinth himself, have sent to the church there many a one whom he does not here name. He names only the last, *Titus*. Besides, Timothy was in fact *joint-writer* of our Epistle.

did not get so far as Corinth, or that he left it again prematurely, compare, in general, Klöpper, p. 4 ff. It must therefore be held that *Paul had received from Timothy news of the impression which the former Epistle had made*. The fact that he makes no mention of this is explained from the circumstance that, in i. 1, Timothy himself appears as joint-sender of the Epistle; whence not only was it obvious to the reader that Timothy on his return had made communications to the apostle, but it would have been unbecoming and awkward if Paul had said that he had received *from Timothy* accounts of the result of his Epistle. For *these* accounts, viz. those of the *first* impression made by the letter, must have been by no means tranquillizing for Paul (ii. 12, vii. 5 ff.). It is true that in Phil. ii. 19 the joint-sender of the letter is named as a third person, but there the state of the case is quite different (in opposition to Hofmann), namely, a special *recommendation* of Timothy, just as the relation of the apostle himself to the church in Philippi with which he was *so affectionately intimate* was very *diverse* from that in which he stood to the Corinthians.

But besides Timothy, *Titus* also at a later period brought to the apostle, who meanwhile had travelled by way of Troas to Macedonia, intelligence of the result of his letter (ii. 12, vii. 5 ff.). Paul had delegated the latter to Corinth *after* our first Epistle,¹ and after Timothy had again arrived in Ephesus from the journey mentioned in 1 Cor. xvi. 10 f., comp. iv. 17; and it is natural that from Titus he should have received further (as also more tranquillizing) intelligence than from Timothy, because the former came later to Corinth.

The *occasion* of our Epistle, which Titus was to bear (viii. 6), was therefore given by *the accounts which first of all Timothy, but mainly Titus, had brought regarding the effect produced by the previous letter on the dispositions and relations of the Corinthian church*.

REMARK.—The special object that Paul had in sending Titus to Corinth we do not know; for viii. 6 does not refer to *this* journey (see vv. 23, 24), but to the later, second journey, in which this Epistle itself was entrusted to him. The supposition of Eichhorn, Bertholdt, Neander, de Wette, and some others, that the apostle had despatched Titus out of anxiety about the impression which his first Epistle might make on the Corinthians, is a conjecture which receives some probability from ii. 12, vii. 5 ff., especially if we suppose that, before Titus was sent off, Timothy had returned with very disquieting news. Bleek

¹ Schrader, indeed (I. pp. 137, 262), and Billroth, to whose view Rückert also inclines, have assumed that Titus was sent to Corinth *before* our first Epistle, perhaps with the one now lost, and on account of the matter of the collection, and that he was therefore in that city when our first Epistle arrived there. But in that case Paul would have mentioned Titus in his first Epistle (especially xvi. 1 ff.), just as he mentions Timothy; and at least a greeting to him would not have been forgotten. Billroth thinks that Paul had probably al-

ready in the lost Epistle said enough in recommendation of Titus. But does this make a greeting in the Epistle that follows superfluous? Rückert says that the bearers of our first Epistle had perhaps brought with them a special letter to Titus, or instructions by word of mouth, which, however, is a mere conjecture to which he is constrained to resort. Müller also, *De trib. Pauli itineribus Corinth. susceptis*, Bas. 1831, agrees with Schrader, without, however, admitting the loss of an Epistle, at 1 Cor. v. 9.

(in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1830, p. 625 ff., and in his *Introduction*) supposes, and Credner (*Einleit.* I. 2, p. 371), Olshausen, Neander, Hilgenfeld (*Zeitschr.* 1864, p. 167), Beyschlag (in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1865, p. 253), and Klöpper (*l.c.* p. 3 ff.) agree with him, that Paul, after Timothy's return, sent to the Corinthians by Titus a letter of very strong reproof (which is now lost). But our first Epistle contained enough—especially after (Timothy had already brought with him disquieting news—to excite in Paul apprehensions regarding the severity of his letter (i. 15 ff., iii. 2, 3, iv. 8, 18–21, v. 1 ff., vi. 8, xi. 17 ff., *al.*), enough to be used by the evil-disposed in bringing a charge of boastfulness (ii. 16, iv. 1 ff., ix., xiv. 18, xv. 8, 10, *al.*); while the second Epistle contains nothing which required Bleek's supposition to explain it, as will appear at such passages as ii. 3, 4 ff., vii. 8, 11, 14, *al.*; see in general, in opposition to Bleek's hypothesis, Müller, *de tribus Pauli itineribus*, p. 34 ff.; Wurm, in the *Tüb. Zeitschr.* 1833, 1, p. 66 ff.; Wieseler, *Chronol. des apost. Zeitalt.* p. 366 ff.; Baur, Hofmann, and others. According to Ewald, as he has more precisely defined and modified (*Sendschr. des. Ap. Paulus*, p. 224 ff.¹) his earlier hypothetical arrangement (*Jahrb.* II. p. 227 f.), the position of things in Corinth after our first Epistle had in part been aggravated, especially by a Petrine opponent of Paul from Jerusalem; Paul had got information of this from Timothy on his return and otherwise, and had himself made a short journey from Ephesus to Corinth in order to restore harmony to the church; after his departure, being calumniated and slandered anew (especially by a member of very high repute), he then sent from Ephesus a very severe letter by Titus to Corinth; and this letter, which has not been presented to us, brought the church to bethink itself, as he learned from Titus, who joined him in Macedonia. On this account, and also because there still remained various evils to be rectified, he at last wrote our second Epistle to the Corinthians, and had it sent likewise by means of Titus. A supposition of this kind is necessary, if the person mentioned in ii. 5 ff. cannot be the one guilty of incest in 1 Cor. v. But see on ii. 5–11; and for the supposed intermediate journey to Corinth, see § 2, Remark.

The *aim* of the Epistle is stated by Paul himself at xiii. 10, viz. to put the church before his arrival in person into that frame of mind, which it was necessary that he should find, in order that he might thereupon set to work among them, not with stern corrective authority, but for their edification. But in order to attain this aim, he had to make it his chief task to elucidate, confirm, and vindicate his apostolic authority, which, in consequence of his former letter, had been assailed still more vehemently, openly, and influentially by opponents. For, if that were regained, his whole influence would be regained; if the church were again confirmed on this point, and the opposition defeated, every hindrance to his successful personal labour amongst them would be removed. With the establishment of his apostolic character and reputation he is therefore chiefly occupied in the whole Epistle; everything else is only subordinate, including a detailed appeal respecting the collection.

As to *contents*, the whole falls, after the salutation and introduction, into three parts: I. Paul sets forth his apostolic character and course of life,

¹ Comp. also his *Gesch. d. Apost. Zeit.* p. 520 ff., ed. 3.

and interweaves with it affectionate outpourings of his heart over the impression produced by his former letter,—an ingenious apology, closing with expressions of praise and confidence,¹ chap. i.–vii. II. Regarding the collection, chap. viii. ix. III. Polemical assertion of his apostolic dignity against its opponents, with some irritation, and even not without sarcasm and bitterness, but forcible and triumphant. Conclusion.

REMARK 1.—The excitement and varied play of emotion with which Paul wrote this letter, probably also in haste, certainly make the expression not seldom obscure and the sentences less flexible, but only heighten our admiration of the great delicacy, skill, and power with which this outpouring of Paul's spirit and heart, possessing as a defence of himself a high and peculiar interest, flows and gushes on, till finally, in the last part, wave on wave overwhelms the hostile resistance. In reference to this, Erasmus aptly says, in the dedication of his *Paraphr.*: “Sudatur ab eruditissimis viris in explicandis poetarum ac rhetorum consiliis, at in hoc rhetore longe plus sudoris est ut deprehendas quid agat, quo tendat, quid vetet; adeo stropharum plenus est undique, absit invidia verbis. Tanta vafricies est, non credas eundem hominem loqui. Nunc ut limpidus quidam fons sensim edullit, mox torrentis in morem ingenti fragore devolvitur, multa obiter secum rapiens, nunc placide leniterque fluit, nunc late, velut in lacum diffusus, exspatiatur. Rursum alicubi se condit, ac diverso loco subitus emicat, cum visum est, miris Maeandris nunc has nunc illas lambit ripas, aliquoties procul digressus, reciprocato flexu in sese redit.”²

REMARK 2.—The *opponents* specially combated from chap. x. onwards, were at any rate *Judaists* (xi. 22, Rübiger, p. 191 ff.; Neander), and therefore, from a party point of view, to be reckoned as belonging to the *Petrine* section. It is only the *Petrine*, and not the *Christine* party (Schenkel, Goldhorn, Kniewel, Baur, de Wette, Thiersch, Osiander, Beyschlag, Hilgenfeld, Klöpper), that suits the character of disputing, directly and specially, the apostolic authority of *Paul*, whether we regard the Christines as a party by themselves, or, with Baur (see on 1 Cor. i. 12), as part of the Petrines.

REMARK 3.—The division of the Epistle into *two halves, separate in point of time*, so that the part up to vii. 1 was written *before* the arrival of Titus, and the part from vii. 2 onwards *after* it (Wieseler, p. 356 ff.), cannot be justified either exegetically or psychologically on the ground of vii. 6; while, on the ground of ii. 12–14, it can only be regarded as exegetically inadmissible.

§ 2.—PLACE, TIME, GENUINENESS AND UNITY.

When Paul wrote this letter, he was no longer in Ephesus (i. 8), but had already arrived by way of Troas in *Macedonia* (ii. 13, vii. 5, viii. 1, ix. 2, comp. Acts xx. 1), where Titus, whom he had already expected with longing

¹ Luther, *Preface*: “In the first Epistle, St. Paul rebuked the Corinthians severely on many points, and poured sharp wine into their wounds, and alarmed them. But now an apostle should be a comforting preacher, . . . therefore he praises them anew in this Epistle, and pours oil into the wounds,” etc.

² We may confidently apply to our Epistle what Dionysius, *De admir. vi. dic. in Dem.* 8, says of Demosthenes' mode of speaking, which he calls: μεγαλοπρεπῆ, λιτὴν· περιττὴν, ἀπέριττον· ἐξηλλαγμένην, συνήθη· πανηγυρικὴν, ἀληθινὴν· αὐστηρὰν, ἰλαρὰν· σύντονον, ἀνειμένην· ἡδεῖαν, πικρὰν· ἐθικὴν, παθετικὴν.

in Troas (ii. 12), returned to him. A more precise specification of the place (the subscriptions in B and in many later codd., also in the Peshitto, name *Philippi*) cannot be made good. The *date of composition* appears to be the same year, 58 (yet not before the month Tisri, see on viii. 10), in which, shortly before Easter, he had written our First Epistle, and after Pentecost had left Ephesus (see Introd. to 1 Cor. § 3). Paul at that time intended to come to Corinth for the third time, as he actually did soon after his letter to his readers (Acts xx. 2).

REMARK.—From ii. 1, xii. 14, 21, xiii. 1, 2, it follows of necessity that Paul before he wrote his Epistles to the Corinthians, had been in Corinth, not *once* only, on the occasion when he founded the church (as Reiche in his *Comment. crit.* seeks again to establish), but *twice*. For in xiii. 1, *τρίτον τοῦτο ἔρχομαι* cannot mean, “I am now *on the point* of coming for the third time:” hence also xiii. 2 *must* be understood of a second visit which had already taken place; in ii. 1 and xii. 21, *ἐν λύπῃ* and *ταπεινώσῃ* (which latter is to be connected with *πάλιν*) cannot refer to the first visit; and finally, in xii. 14, *τρίτον* must belong to *ἔλθειν*, not to *ἐτοίμως ἔχω*, as is made certain by the context (see the commentary on these passages). With justice, therefore, has this view been maintained, after Chrysostom, Oecumenius, and Theophylact, by Erasmus, Baronius, Mill, Michaelis, and others, and recently by Schrader, Bleek (in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1830, p. 614 ff.), Müller (*Diss. de trib. Pauli. itineribus Corinthum*, etc., Basil. 1831) Schott (*Erört. einiger wicht. chronol. Punkte*, p. 51 ff.), Schneckenburger (*Beitr.* p. 166), Wurm, Anger (*rat. temp.* p. 70 ff.), Billroth, Credner, Olshausen, Rückert, Wieseler, Reuss, Osiander, Hofmann, and others. See the commentary in opposition to the explaining away of these passages, according to which “the third journey of Paul to Corinth is a fiction” (Lange, *apost. Zeitalt.* I. p. 199; comp. Baur in the *theol. Jahrb.* 1850, 2, p. 139 ff., and in his *Paulus*, I. p. 339 ff., ed. 2). But it cannot be definitely decided whether the second journey to Corinth is to be placed in the time of the three years’ stay at Ephesus (Schrader, Billroth, Olshausen, Rückert, Wieseler, Reuss, and Hofmann; Bleek is also inclined to this), or whether it is to be considered only as the return from a longer excursion during the eighteen months’ stay in Corinth (Baronius, Michaelis, Schmidt, Schott, Anger; favored by Bleek; comp. Neander on ii. 1); for *ἵνα δευτέραν χάριν ἔχητε*, in i. 15, testifies neither for nor against either of these views (see on this passage). Still by that very circumstance the latter view loses its support, and has, besides, against it the point that, as the first and third journeys were *special* journeys to Corinth, so also his second journey, to which he refers by *τρίτον τοῦτο ἔρχομαι* and the like, is most naturally to be regarded as a *special* journey, and not as a mere return from a wider excursion. See, moreover, Wieseler, p. 239. The proposal to place the second journey to Corinth between our first and a lost Epistle which preceded our second (Ewald, see § 1), finds, apart altogether from the lost letter being an hypothesis, no sufficient confirmation in the passages concerned, ii. 1, xii. 14, xiii. 1 f., and has i. 23 (*οὐκέτι*) against it; comp. 1 Cor. xvi. 5 ff. and 2 Cor. i. 15 f.

The *genuineness* of our Epistle (see, after less certain indications in the apostolic Fathers and Justin, Irenaeus, *Haer.* ii. 7. 1, iv. 28. 3; Athenagoras, *de resurr.* p. 61, ed. Col.; Clement, *Strom.* iv. p. 514, ed. Sylb.;

Tertullian, *de pudic.* 13) is as internally certain and as unanimously attested and undisputed as that of the first ; in fact, we need hardly notice, even historically, the strange theory invented by Bolten and Bertholdt, that it was translated (by Timothy) from the Aramaic.

The *unity* of the Epistle has been contested by Semler and Weber ; while it has been most arbitrarily cut up into three letters by Weisse (see his *Beitr. u. Krit. d. Paul. Br.*, edited by Sulze, p. 9). Semler (see Keggemann, *praes. Semler, de duplici ep. ad Rom. append.*, Hal. 1767, and Semler, *Paraphr.* 1776) cuts it up into the following *three* letters : (1) chap. i. viii., Rom. xvi., and 2 Cor. xiii. 11–13 ; (2) x. 1–xiii. 10 ; (3) chap. ix., as a special leaf which was intended, not for Corinth, but for the Christians in Achaia. In opposition to this, see Gabler, *de capp. ult. ix.–xiii. poster. ep. P. ad Cor. ab eadem haud separand.*, Gött. 1782. Weber (*de numero epp. P. ad Cor. rectius constituendo*, 1798) was of opinion that there were originally two letters :—(1) chap. i.–ix. and xiii. 11–13 ; (2) chap. x. 1–xiii. 10. Similarly, also, von Greeve (in Royards *de altera P. ad Cor. ep.*, Traj. ad Rhen. 1818), who, however, considers as the first letter only chap. i.–viii. In opposition to these attempts at dismemberment may be urged not only the whole body of the critical witnesses, but also the certainty that the abruptness of chap. ix. is only apparent, and that the contrasting tone of chap. x.–xiii. is easily explained ¹ by the altered mood of the apostle.—With regard to the originality of vi. 14–vii. 1, see on vi. 12, Remark.

¹ Hug, *Einl.* II. § 108, says very pertinently : “Who would on that account break up the speech of Demosthenes *pro Corona* into two parts, because in the more general vindication calm and caution prevail ;

whereas, in heaping shame and castigation on the informer, in the parallel between him and Aeschines, words of bitter mockery gush forth impetuously like a thunder-shower.”

Παύλου πρὸς Κορινθίους ἐπιστολὴ δευτέρα.

A B K $\aleph$, min. have only πρὸς Κορινθίους B., the most simple, and doubtless the oldest superscription.

CHAPTER I.

Ver. 6. εἴτε παρακαλούμεθα, ὑπὲρ τῆς ὑμῶν παρακλήσεως, τῆς ἐνεργουμένης ἐν ὑπομονῇ τῶν αὐτῶν παθημάτων, ὧν καὶ ἡμεῖς πάσχομεν· καὶ ἡ ἐλπίς ἡμῶν βεβαία ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν· εἰδότες κ.τ.λ.] So Beza, ed. 3, 4, 5, Beng. and Griesb., following A C, min. Syr. Erp. Copt. Aeth. Arm. Flor. Harl. Vulg. Ephr. Antioch. Ambrosiast. Pel. Beda. But Elz. (following Erasm. ed. 2¹) : τῆς ἐνεργουμένης ἐν ὑπομονῇ τῶν αὐτῶν παθημάτων ὧν καὶ ἡμεῖς πάσχομεν· εἴτε παρακαλούμεθα, ὑπὲρ τῆς ὑμῶν παρακλήσεως καὶ σωτηρίας· καὶ ἡ ἐλπίς ἡμ. βεβ. ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν· εἰδότες κ.τ.λ. Finally, Lachm. Tisch. Scholz, and Rück. read, with Matth., after Erasm. ed. 1 : καὶ ἡ ἐλπίς ἡμ. βεβ. ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν immediately after πάσχομεν, but in other respects with Elz., and have the support of B D E F G K L $\aleph$, min. Ar. pol. Goth. Syr. p. Slav. It. Chrys. Theodoret, Damasc. Phot. Theophyl. Oec. The *Recepta* must be rejected on account of the want of ancient attestation, and the choice remains only between Griesbach's and Lachmann's reading. The latter is defended most thoroughly by Reiche, *Comment. crit.* I. p. 318 ff. But the former, sufficiently attested, appears to be the original, in so far as from it the rise of the others is easily and naturally explained. An immediate transition was made from the first παρακλ. to the second ; the intermediate words were left out, and brought in again afterwards at wrong places, so that the corruption of the text proceeded thus :—1. *Original form* of ver. 6 as in Griesb. 2. *First corruption* : εἴτε δὲ θλιβόμεθα, ὑπὲρ τῆς ὑμῶν παρακλήσεως, τῆς ἐνεργουμένης ἐν ὑπομ. τῶν αὐτῶν παθημ. ὧν κ. ἡμεῖς πάσχομεν· καὶ ἡ ἐλπίς ἡμῶν βεβαία ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν. 3. *Erroneous restoration* : εἴτε δὲ θλιβόμεθα . . . ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν· εἴτε παρακαλούμεθα, ὑπὲρ τῆς ὑμῶν παρακλ. Another erroneous restoration (“*ex judicio eclecticico*,” Beng. *Appar.*) is contained in the Received text. 4. The καὶ σωτηρίας, still wanting, was finally added, in part rightly only after the first παρακλ., in part wrongly only after the second παρακλ. (B, 176), in part wrongly after both. — Ver. 8. ὑπὲρ τῆς θλ.] A C D E F G $\aleph$, min. Bas. Chrys. Theodoret, Antioch. have περὶ τ. θλ. So Lachm. Rück. But περί offered itself as more current. — ἡμῶν] is wanting in preponderant witnesses. Suspected by Griesb., rejected by Lachm. Rück. A superfluous gloss on γενομ. — Ver. 10. καὶ ῥύεται] is wanting in A D* Syr. Clar. Germ. Vulg. ms. Chrys. Ambrosiast. So Rück. But B C $\aleph$, 73, 93, 211, Copt. Aeth. Arm. Slav. ms. Tol. Boern. Ath. Damasc. have καὶ ῥύεται. So Lachm., but in brackets. Thus the *Recepta*, reverted to even by Tisch., has certainly preponderating testimony against it ; still it retains the considerable attestation of D*** E F G

¹ Luther and Castalio have translated according to this reading.

K L, and most min. Vulg. Syr. p. Theodoret, Theophylact, Oec. Or. int. Jer., and the subsequent *ῥύσεται* might very easily be written directly after *καί* instead of *ῥύεται*, so that subsequently, owing to the erroneous restoration of what was left out, the spurious *καὶ ῥύσεται* in some cases remained, but in others was dropped without the genuine *καὶ ῥύεται* being put in its place. — Ver. 11. *εὐχαρ. ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν*] The reading *εὐχαρ. ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν*, though preferred by Beng., recommended by Reiche, and adopted by Tisch., has weaker attestation, and does not suit the sense. — Ver. 12. *ἀπλότητι*] A B C K *Σ** min. Copt. Arm. Clem. Or. Damasc. have *ἀγίοτητι*. So Lachm. Rück. Rightly; *ἀπλότητι*, though defended by Reiche and Tisch., must be considered as a gloss of more precise definition; it was from our very Epistle well known and current, whereas *ἀγίοτης* was unfamiliar (only elsewhere in Heb. xii. 10). — Ver. 13. The first *ἡ* is wanting in A, min. Bracketed by Rück. But appearing superfluous, and not being understood, it was omitted. — Ver. 16. *διελθεῖν*] A D* F G, 80, Copt. Chrys. Damasc.: *ἀπελθεῖν*. Recommended by Griesb., adopted by Lachm. and Rück. Rightly; it was more natural to introduce the reminiscence of 1 Cor. xvi. 5 than that of Rom. xv. 28. — Ver. 17. *βουλόμενος*] Elz. and Tisch. have *βουλευόμενος*, against preponderant evidence. Gloss in accordance with what follows. — Ver. 18. *ἐγένετο*] Lachm. Scholz, Rück. Tisch. have *ἐστίν*, as Griesb. also recommended, in accordance with a great preponderance of testimony. *ἐγένετο*, which Reiche defends, came in from ver. 19. — Ver. 20. *καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ*] A B C F G *Σ*, min. vss. and Fathers have *διὸ καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ*. So Lachm. Rück. The *Recepta* arose in this way: *διὸ* fell out by an omission of the copyist (so still D* Clar. Germ.), and was then added to *δι' αὐτοῦ* after the previous *ἐν αὐτῷ* as a gloss, which accordingly came into the text. This alteration was the more natural, as the two definitions *δι' αὐτοῦ* and *δι' ἡμῶν* might seem not to accord. The liturgical reference of the *ἀμήν* does not appear a sufficient occasion for the insertion of *διὸ*, nor for the change from *ἐν αὐτῷ* into *δι' αὐτοῦ*, particularly after the *ἐν αὐτῷ* which went before and was left unglossed. This in opposition to Fritzsche, *de conform.* Lachm. p. 56, and Reiche, *Comment. crit.* I. 331 ff.

Vv. 1, 2. Address and greeting. — *διὰ θελ. Θεοῦ*] See on 1 Cor. i. 1. — *καὶ Τιμόθ.*] His relation to this Epistle is the same as that of Sosthenes to the first Epistle: he appears, not as *amanuensis*, but as (subordinate) *joint-sender* of it. See on 1 Cor. i. 1. — *ὁ ἀδελφ.*] as at 1 Cor. i. 1. — *σὺν τοῖς ἀγίοις πᾶσι κ.τ.λ.*] Grotius: “Vult P. exempla hujus epistolae mitti ad alias in Achaia ecclesias.” So also Rosenmüller, Emmerling, and others. But, in that case, would not Paul have rather written *σὺν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις πάσαις*? Comp. Gal. i. 2. And are the contents of the Epistle suited for an encyclical destination? No; he means, in agreement with 1 Cor. i. 2, the Christians living outside of Corinth, scattered through Achaia, who attached themselves to the church-community in Corinth, which must therefore have been the sole seat of a church — the metropolis of the Christians in the province. The state of matters in Galatia was different. — Under *Achaia* we must, according to the sense then attached to it, understand *Hellas* and *Peloponnesus*. This province and that of Macedonia comprehended all Greece. See on Acts xviii. 12. — Ver. 2. See on Rom. i. 7.

Vv. 3–11. A conciliatory introduction,—an effusion of affectionate emotion

(comp. Eph. i. 3) out of the fulness of special and still recent experience. There is no hint of *a set purpose* in it ; and it is an arbitrary supposition, whether the purpose be found in an excuse for the delay of his journey (Chrysostom, Theophylact), or in a confirmation of his apostolic standing (Beza, comp. Calovius, Mosheim), or in an attestation of the old love, which Paul presupposes also on the part of the readers (Billroth), and at the same time in a slight alienation which had been suggested by his sufferings (Osiander).

Ver. 3. 'Ο Θεὸς κ. πατ. κ.τ.λ.] *God, who is at the same time father of Jesus Christ.* See on 1 Cor. xv. 24 ; Rom. xv. 6. Against the connection of τοῦ κυρίου κ.τ.λ. also with ὁ Θεός (Hofmann), see on Eph. i. 3. — ὁ πατὴρ τῶν οἰκτιρμῶν] אֲבִי הַרַחֲמִים, i.e. the Father, whose fatherly frame of mind and disposition is *compassionateness*,—*the compassionate Father* (μάλιστα ἰδιον Θεοῦ καὶ ἐξαίρετον καὶ τῇ φύσει συγκεκληρωμένον, Chrysostom). Comp. on 1 Cor. ii. 8 and Eph. i. 17. It is the *qualitative* genitive, such as we find in the language of the Greek poets (Seidl. *ad Electr.* 651 ; Herm. *ad Viger.* p. 890 f.). Rückert (comp. before him Theodoret) takes it as the *genitivus effecti* : “The Father *from whom all compassion comes*” (comp. xiii. 11 ; Rom. xv. 5, 13, *al.*). But, since οἰκτιρμοί (comp. Plato, *Polit.* p. 305 B) is the *subjective* compassion (Tittm. *Synon.* 69 f.), it would have to be explained : “The Father *who works in us compassion, sympathy*,” and this sense would be altogether unsuitable to the connection. On the contrary, τῶν οἰκτιρμ. is the specific *quality* of the Father, which dwells in Him just as the Father of Christ, and in consequence of which He is also Θεὸς πάσης παρακλ. ; and *this* genitive is that of the effect which issues from the Merciful One : “The compassionate Father and *God who worketh every consolation.*” This rendering, differing from that of the first genitive, is demanded by ver. 4 (in opposition to Hofmann) ; comp. vii. 6 ; Rom. xv. 5. As to οἰκτιρμοί, see on Rom. xii. 1. Observe that the characteristic appellation of God in this passage is an artless outflow of the *experience*, which was still fresh in the pious heart of the apostle, vv. 8–10. (GG³)

Ver. 4. Ἡμεῖς] Where Paul in this Epistle does not mean himself exclusively, but wishes to include Timothy also (or others, according to the context), although often only as quite subordinate, he speaks in the *plural*. He does not express himself *communicativè*, but in the *singular*, where he gives utterance to his own personal conviction or, in general, to anything concerning himself individually (vv. 13, 15, 17, 23, ii. 1–10, 12, 13, vii. 4, 7 ff., *al.*). Hence the frequent interchange between the singular and plural forms of expression.¹—Chrysostom already gives the force of the *present* παρακαλῶν correctly : ὅτι οὐχ ἅπαξ, οὐδὲ δις, ἀλλὰ διηνεκῶς τοῦτο ποιεῖ . . . διὸ εἶπεν ὁ παρακαλῶν, οὐχ ὁ παρακαλέσας. — ἐπὶ πάσῃ τῇ θλίψει] *concerning all our affliction.* The collective sufferings are regarded as one whole. Afterwards,

¹ Even in the plural mode of expression, however, he has always *himself* and *his own* relations *primarily* in view ; and, owing to the versatility of his mode of conception, it is often quite a matter of accident whether

he expresses himself *singulariter* or *communicativè*. Hence the interchange of the two modes of expression in one sentence, e.g. xi. 6 f.

on the other hand, ἐν πάσῃ θλ.: *in every affliction*. ἐπί marks the ethical foundation, *i.e.* here the *cause, on account of which*. See Matthiae, p. 1373. Comp. 2 Macc. vii. 5 f.; Deut. xxxii. 36. According to Rück., παρακαλ. denotes the *delivering*, and hence he takes ἐπί of the circumstances: *in*. See Matthiae, p. 1370. But throughout the passage παρακ. means *to comfort*; and it is quite an open question, *how* the comforting takes place, whether by calming or by delivering. God did both in the apostle's case. — εἰς τὸ δύνασθαι κ.τ.λ.] *in order that we may be able*, etc. For he, who for himself received comfort from God, is *by his experience* placed in the position of being able to comfort others. And how important was this teleological view of his own sorrows for the apostolic calling! "Omnia sua P. ad utilitatem ecclesiae refert," Grotius. (HH³) — τοὺς ἐν πάσῃ θλίψει] is erroneously and arbitrarily taken as equivalent to πάντας τοὺς ἐν θλίψει (see Emmerling, Flatt, Rückert). It means: *those to be found in every trouble, the all-distressed*; not: *those to be found in whatever sort of trouble* (Hofmann), but ἐν παντὶ θλιβόμενοι, iv. 8, vii. 5. — διὰ τῆς παρακλ. κ.τ.λ.] *i.e. through communication of our own comfort, which we experience from God*. This more precise determination of the sense is demanded both by the preceding mention of the purpose εἰς τὸ δύνασθαι κ.τ.λ., and by the αὐτοί. Olshausen, it is true, holds that Paul conceives the comfort to be a real power of the Spirit, which may again be conveyed to others by the receiver. But there is no analogy in the whole N. T. for this conception; for Matt. x. 13 is merely a concrete illustration of the efficacy or non-efficacy of the εἰρήνη ὑμῶν. — ἧς] Attracted, as in Eph. i. 6, iv. 1, because one can say παράκλησιν παρακαλεῖν. See Gieseler in Rosenmüller, *Repert.* II. p. 124; Buttmann, *neut. Gr.* p. 247 [E. T. 287]. The attracted genitive instead of the dative in other cases is very rare. See Kühner, *ad Xen. Mem.* ii. 2. 5. — αὐτοί] *ipsi*, for our own selves, in contrast to the *others* to be comforted.

Ver. 5. Ground assigned for the ἧς παρακαλούμεθα αὐτοὶ ὑπὸ τ. Θεοῦ. — περισσεύει εἰς ἡμᾶς] *is abundant in relation to us, i.e. it is imparted to us above measure*, in a very high degree. Comp. Rom. v. 15. — τὰ παθήματα τοῦ Χριστοῦ] are not *the sufferings for Christ's sake* (so Pelagius and most), which cannot be expressed by the simple genitive, but *the sufferings of Christ* (Winer, Billroth, Olshausen, Neander, Ewald, Hofmann), in so far as every one who suffers for the gospel suffers the same in category as Christ suffered. (r³) Comp. Matt. xx. 22; Phil. iii. 10; Col. i. 24; Heb. xiii. 13; 1 Pet. iv. 13. See also on Rom. viii. 17. Hence Cornelius à Lapide, Leum, and Rückert render correctly *in substance*: quales passus est Christus." But Chrysostom, Theophylact, Oecumenius, Beza, Calovius, and others are wrong, who render: "the sufferings, *which Christ endures in His members*:" comp. de Wette and Osiander. For the conception of a Christ continuing to suffer in His members is nowhere found in the N. T., not even in Acts ix. 4, and is contrary to the idea of His exaltation. See on Col. i. 24. — διὰ τοῦ Χ.] through His indwelling by means of the Spirit. See Rom. viii. 9, 10; Eph. iii. 17; Col. i. 29, *al.*

Vv. 6, 7. Δέ] leading on to the gain, which the two, this affliction and this comforting, bring *to the readers*. — *Be it that we are afflicted, we are afflicted*

for the sake of YOUR consolation and salvation ; it redounds to this, that you are to be comforted and advanced in the attainment of Messianic salvation. In how far ? According to Erasmus, Calvin, Estius, Calovius, Wetstein, and many, including Rosenmüller, Flatt, Emmerling, Reiche : through the *example* of the apostle in his confidence towards God, etc. But the context has as little of this as of what is imported by Billroth and Olshausen : “in so far as I suffer in the service of the gospel, through which comfort and salvation come to you ;” so also Hofmann. Rückert, without ground, gives up all attempt at explanation. Paul himself has given the explanation in ver. 4 by εἰς τὸ δύνασθαι ἡμᾶς παρακαλεῖν κ.τ.λ. Hence the sense of the definition of the aim ὑπὲρ τῆς ὑμῶν παρακλ. κ. σωτ. : “in order that we may be enabled to comfort you, when ye come into affliction, and to further your salvation. For this end we are put in a position by experience of suffering, as well as by that, which is its other side, by our experience of comfort in the school of suffering (εἴτε παρακαλούμεθα κ.τ.λ.). — ὑπὲρ τῆς ὑμ. παρακλ. τῆς ἐνεργ. κ.τ.λ.] i.e. in order to be able to give you the comfort, which is efficacious, etc. Paul does not again add κ. σωτηρίας here, because he has still to append to παρακλήσεως a more precise and detailed explanation, after which it was impracticable to bring in καὶ σωτηρίας ; and it could be left out all the more readily, as it did not belong essentially to the representation. — τῆς ἐνεργουμ. ἐν ὑπομ. κ.τ.λ.] which is efficacious in patient endurance of the same sufferings, which we also suffer. ἐνεργουμ., as in the whole N. T. (iv. 12 ; Rom. vii. 5 ; Gal. v. 6 ; Eph. iii. 20 ; Col. i. 29 ; 1 Thess. ii. 13 ; 2 Thess. ii. 7 ; Jas. v. 16) is *middle*, not *passive* (3 Esdr. ii. 20 ; Polyb. i. 13. 5, ix. 12. 3), as it is here erroneously taken by Oecumenius, Theophylact, Castalio, Piscator, Calvin, Grotius, Estius, and others, including Rosenmüller, Emmerling, Billroth, Rückert, Ewald.¹ For the distinction between *active* (personal efficacy) and *middle* in Paul, see Winer, p. 242 [E. T. 323]. — ἐν ὑπομονῇ] denotes that by virtue of providing which the παράκλησις is efficacious. It is therefore the working of the Christian παράκλησις, which we experience when ἡ θλίψις ὑπομονὴν κατεργάζεται, Rom. v. 3. — τῶν αὐτῶν παθημάτων, ὧν κ.τ.λ.] in so far, namely, as they are likewise sufferings of Christ. The sufferings appointed to the readers are meant, which do not differ in kind from the sufferings of Paul (and Timothy) (ὧν κ. ἡμεῖς πάσχομεν). Billroth, Olshausen, Neander understand the sufferings of the apostle himself, in so far as these were jointly felt by all believers as their own in virtue of their fellowship of love with him. Compare Chrysostom on ver. 7, also de Wette, who refers it partly to the foreboding, partly to the sympathetic joint-suffering. But, then, Paul would have been utterly illogical in placing the καί before ἡμεῖς ; for it would, in fact, be sufferings which the readers also had suffered (with Paul through their loving sympathy). How erroneous this exposition is, is shown, besides, by ver. 4. It does not appear from this passage, we may add, that at that time the Corinthians had otherwise to endure affliction for the gospel's

¹ The *passive* interpretation would be necessary with the reading of Lachmann, since *salvation* is the goal of the state of grace, and hence is wrought (Phil. ii. 12, 13 ;

Matt. x. 22 ; Jas. i. 12) ; but nowhere is it conceived and represented as *working* in patience, and the like. This tells against that reading.

sake. Paul has rather in view the *case* of such affliction occurring in the *future*, as the following καὶ ἡ ἐλπὶς κ.τ.λ. proves. Comp. on xiii. 11. — καὶ ἡ ἐλπ. ἡμ. βεβ. ὑπ. ὑμ.] is not to be placed in a parenthesis, with Griesbach and others, since εἰδότες is connected not with πάσχομεν, but with ἡ ἐλπὶς ἡμῶν. The contents of ver. 6, namely, is not the expression of a present experience undergone by the readers, but the expression of good *hope* as to the readers for the *future*, that what is said by εἴτε δὲ θλιβόμεθα . . . πάσχομεν will be verified in their case in afflictions which would come on them for Christ's sake, so that they would in that case obtain from the apostle, out of his experience of suffering and consolation, the comfort which through patience is efficacious in such sufferings. Therefore he continues : *and our hope is firm on account of you.* ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν does not belong either simply to ἡ ἐλπ. ὑμ., or simply to βεβαία (Billroth), but to the whole thought of ἡ ἐλπ. ὑμ. βεβ. On ὑπέρ, comp. Polyb. xi. 20. 6, xiv. 1. 5, and the contrary expression φοβεῖσθαι ὑπὲρ τινος, *propter aliquem in metu esse.* — εἰδότες] refers, according to a common anacolouthon, to ἡ ἐλπὶς ἡμ., in which ἡμεῖς is the logical subject.¹ See Stallbaum, *ad. Apol.* p. 21 C, *Phaedr.* p. 241 D, *Phaedo*, p. 81 A ; Fritzsche, *Dissert.* II. p. 49. Comp. on Eph. iv. 2 ; Col. ii. 2. It introduces the *certainty* on which rests the hope just expressed : *for we know that you, as you are sharers of the sufferings, are sharers also of the consolation.* To have a share in the sufferings, and also in the consolation, to be excepted neither from the one nor from the other, is the *appointed lot* of the Christian. Paul *knows* this in regard to his readers, and he grounds on it the firm *hope* for them, that if they shall have their share in bearing *sufferings*, they will in that case not lack the effectual *consolation* ; to impart which consolation he is himself qualified (ver. 4) and destined (ver. 6) by his own experience of suffering and consolation. Accordingly, κοινωνοὶ κ.τ.λ. is contextually not to be explained of an *ideal, sympathetic* communion, and that in the sufferings and consolation of *Paul* (ὥσπερ γὰρ τὰ παθήματα τὰ ἡμέτερα ὑμέτερα εἶναι νομίζετε, οὕτω καὶ τὴν παράκλησιν τὴν ἡμετέραν ὑμετέραν, Chrysostom. Comp. Theodoret, Grotius, Billroth, Olshausen, and others), but τὰ παθήματα and ἡ παράκλησις are to be taken *generically*. In both kinds of experience the Christian has a share ; he must *suffer* ; but he is not excluded from the *consolation* ; on the contrary, he partakes also in it. (J³)

Vv. 8–11. Out of his own (and Timothy's) experience of suffering and comfort, Paul now informs his readers of something special which had lately befallen the two in Asia. The *fact in itself* he assumes as known to them, but he desires to bring to their knowledge *the consoling help of God* in it. There is nothing to indicate a reference to an *utterance of the church* (Hofmann) concerning the event.

Ver. 8. οὐ γ. θέλ. ὑμ. ἀγν.] See on Rom. i. 13, xi. 25 ; 1 Cor. xii. 1 ; 1 Thess. iv. 13. — ὑπὲρ τῆς θλίψ.] *regarding (de) the affliction*, concerning the same. See Bernhardt, p. 244 ; Kühner, II. § 547, 2. — ἐν τῇ Ἀσίᾳ] as in 1 Cor. xvi. 19. What particular affliction is meant, and at what place it hap-

¹ With Lachmann's reading it is referred by Reiche and Ewald to the Corinthians (ὑμῶν) : *since you know*, etc.

pened, we do not know. The readers, who must have known it, may have learnt it from Titus or otherwise. Perhaps it was the ἀντικείμενοι πολλοί, 1 Cor. xvi. 9, who had prepared for him the extraordinary trial. The tumult of Demetrius in Ephesus, Acts xix. 23 ff. (Theodoret, Calvin, Estius, Cornelius à Lapide, Michaelis, Vater, Schrader, Olshausen, Osiander, Ewald, and others), is not to be thought of, since Paul was not in personal danger there, Acts xix. 30, and immediately after the tumult set out on his journey to Greece, Acts xx. 1. Heumann, Emmerling, Rückert, Bisping, suggest a severe *illness*. Against this it may be urged that, according to ver. 5, it must have been a πάθημα τοῦ Χριστοῦ (for the special experience must be held as included under the general one previously spoken of), as well as that Paul speaks in the *plural*. Both grounds tell at the same time against Hofmann, who thinks of the shipwreck, xi. 25, to which, in fact, ἐν τ. Ἀσίᾳ, ver. 8, is not suitable, even if we ventured to make a mere stranding *on the coast* out of the incident. Besides, the reading ῥύεται, ver. 10, militates against this. — ὅτι καθ' ὑπερβ. κ.τ.λ.] *that we were burdened to the uttermost beyond strength*, a statement of that which, in regard to the affliction mentioned, is not to be withheld from the readers. καθ' ὑπερβολήν defines the degree of ἐβαρ. ὑπὲρ δύναμ. See Fritzsche, *Diss.* I. p. 1 f. (“ut calamitates vires meas egregie superarent”). The view which regards the two expressions as co-ordinate (Chrysostom, Luther, Calvin, Estius, and many, including Platt, Rückert, Osiander, Hofmann): *so heavy that it went beyond our ability*, would place alongside of each other the objective greatness of the suffering and its disproportion to the subjectivity (see de Wette): still the position of ἐβαρ., as well as the want of a καί before ὑπέρ, is more favourable to the view which *takes* ἐβαρ. ὑπ. δύν. together; and this is also confirmed by the subjectivity of the following ὥστε ἐξαπορ. κ.τ.λ. The suffering made itself palpable to him as a πειρασμὸς οὐκ ἀνθρώπινος (1 Cor. x. 13). Rückert, moreover, has no ground for thinking that ἐβαρήθ. is inappropriately used of persecutions, attempts to murder, and the like, and that ὑπὲρ δύναμιν is also opposed to it. βαρύς, βαρέω, and βαρύνω are used of *all* troubles by which we feel ourselves burdened. See the passages from Homer in Duncan, *Lex.*, ed. Rost, p. 202; comp. Plat. *Crit.* p. 43 C; Soph. *Trach.* 151; Theocr. xvii. 61, and expressions like βαρύμοχθος, βαρύποτμος, βαρυνπενθής; βαρυνδαίμων, and the like. — ὥστε ἐξαπορ. κ.τ.λ.] *so that we became quite perplexed even (καί) in regard to life*, placed in the highest perplexity even with regard to the preservation of our life. ἐκ strengthens the simple verb, iv. 8. Polyb. i. 62. 1, iii. 47. 9, 48. 4. The genitive (τοῦ ζῆν) is the usual case in Greek with ἀπορεῖν, in the sense of *having lack* of something; seldom is it found in the sense of being *perplexed* about something (Dem. 1380, 4; Plat. *Conv.* p. 193 E).

Ver. 9. Ἀλλά] is the simple *but*, the contrast of the negation contained in ἐξαπορηθῆναι, which contrast, nevertheless, no longer depends on ὥστε: the independent position makes it all the weightier. There is therefore the less ground for taking ἀλλά as *nay indeed*, with Hofmann, and making it point to the following clause of purpose, whereby the chief clause αὐτοῖς κ.τ.λ. would be arbitrarily forced into a position logically subordinate—viz., “if

we ourselves, etc., it was to serve to the end, that we," etc. — *αὐτοὶ ἐν ἑαυτοῖς*] *for our own selves in our own consciousness*—i.e. apart from what might take place from without, through divine interference, to cause a change in our position. This certainty in their own heart, however, could not but exclude all self-confidence; hence *ἵνα μὴ πεποιθότες κ.τ.λ.* — *ἀπόκριμα*] not equivalent to *κατάκριμα* (so most, following Hesychius), but to *responsum* (Vulgate, Billroth), *the award, decision*. Comp. *ἀποκρίσεις*. So in Suidas (see Wetstein) and Josephus, *Antt.* xiv. 17 (in Kypke). Chrysostom says well: *τὴν κρίσιν, τὴν προσδοκίαν τοιαύτην γὰρ ἡφίει τὰ πράγματα φωνήν· τοιαύτην ἀποκρίσιν ἐδίδον τὰ συμβάντα, ὅτι ἀποθανούμεθα πάντως.*—As to *ἐσχῆκ.*, observe the perfect *habuimus*, which represents the situation as present. Comp. on Rom. v. 2. — *ἵνα μὴ κ.τ.λ.*] divinely appointed aim of the *αὐτοὶ . . . ἐσχῆκαμεν*. Comp. 1 Cor. i. 15. (κ³) — *τῷ ἐγείροντι τοὺς νεκρ.*] is to be referred not only to the *future* awaking of the dead, but to the *awaking of the dead in general*, as that which is exclusively *God's* doing. This characteristic of God is the *ground* of the confidence. For the *awaker* of the dead must also be able to *rescue* from the danger of *death* (ver. 10). Comp. Rom. iv. 17; Heb. xi. 19. See on Rom. *l.c.* "Mira natura fidei in summis difficultatibus nullum exitum habere visis," Bengel. Hence Paul, in spite of the human *ἐξαπορηθῆναι*, ver. 8, could yet say of himself, iv. 8: *οὐκ ἐξαπορούμενοι*.

Ver. 10. Result of this confidence, as well as the hope grounded thereon for the future. — *ἐκ τηλικ. θανάτου*] *out of so great death*. Paul realizes to himself the special *so mighty death-power* which had threatened him (and Timothy), and by the expression *ρύεσθαι ἐκ θανάτου* (see examples in Wetstein, p. 178) makes death appear as a hostile power by which he had been encompassed. *Θάνατος* does not signify *peril* of death (as most say, even Emmerling and Flatt), but it represents that *sense*. Comp. xi. 23. — *καὶ ῥύεται*] The *θλίψις*, which had been survived in Asia, therefore still continued in its after-effects, which even extended over to Macedonia (perhaps by continued plots against their lives), and Paul and Timothy were still continuing¹ to experience the rescuing power of God. (L³)—*ἡλπίκαμεν*] *have set our hope*. See Herm. *ad Viger.* p. 748; Kühner, II. p. 71; comp. 1 Cor. xv. 19; 1 Tim. v. 5, vi. 17; John vi. 45.—*ὅτι κ. ἔτι ῥύσεται*] *that he will rescue (us) even further*, namely, *ἐκ τηλικ. θανάτου*, in the continuing danger from the Asiatic enemies which was still to be apprehended in the future. In the fact that Paul speaks of a present, nay, of a future rescue, Rückert finds a support for his opinion regarding a dangerous illness (not yet fully overcome); see on ver. 8. But could no machinations pass over from Asia to Macedonia? and

¹ Hofmann reads the passage: *καὶ ῥύσεται, εἰς ὃν ἡλπίκαμεν, καὶ ἔτι ῥύσεται*. Accordingly, he takes the first *καὶ* as an *also*, beginning an independent sentence. With this expressive reference to the future Paul looks forward to the wide *voyages* still before him. In opposition to this we have, from a critical point of view, the facts that *ὅτι* before *καὶ ἔτι* is wanting only in B D* 64, and that it is supported by preponderating

witnesses, even by those which have the reading *ῥύσεται* for *ῥύεται*, as C and 8; and from an exegetical point of view, the fact that the repetition *καὶ ἔτι ῥύσεται* amounts to a tautology without strengthening the thought in the least: for *ἔτι* follows as a matter of course from the *ῥύσεται* already said. Besides, against the whole reference to the shipwreck, see on ver. 8.

could not these be recognized by Paul as the more dangerous, in so far as they were more secret? Comp. Acts xx. 3.

Ver. 11. A trustful and conciliatory mention of the intercessions of the readers. This is regarded as not so much *conditioning* (Erasmus, Rosenmüller, Rückert, and others), as rather *furthering* the καὶ ἐτι ῥύσεται: “he will also still save us, *since ye also are helpful together for us*,” etc. On the idea of the efficacy of intercession, comp. especially Phil. i. 19; Rom. xv. 30 f.—The reference of the συν in συννυπουργ. is to the *apostle’s* own work of prayer, with which that of the readers is joined by way of help: similar help on the part of *other* churches is just hinted by the καί before ὑμῶν. — ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν] *on our behalf*. A transposition for τῇ δεήσει ὑπὲρ ἡμ. would indeed be grammatically possible (Bernhardy, p. 461), but is in the highest degree superfluous (in opposition to Erasmus, Grotius, Schulz, Rosenmüller). — ἵνα ἐκ πολλ. προσώπ. κ.τ.λ.] divinely-appointed aim of the συννυπουργ. κ.τ.λ. The correlations are to be noted: 1. ἐκ πολλῶν προσώπ. and τὸ εἰς ἡμᾶς χάρ.; 2. διὰ πολλῶν and ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν; 3. χάρισμα and εὐχαριστηθῇ. Accordingly, there stand parallel to one another ἐκ πολλ. προσώπ. and then διὰ πολλῶν; as also τὸ εἰς ἡμᾶς χάρισμα and then ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν. Hence, it is to be connected and taken thus: *that from many countenances for the gift of grace made to us by means of many thanks may be rendered on our behalf*. Paul means that the thanksgiving for *his* (and Timothy’s) *rescue* (i.e. τὸ εἰς ἡμ. χάρ.¹) is not to be offered to God by himself (and Timothy) alone, but that it is to be a rendering of thanks made for him by many through the mediation of many. The *many* are the *same* in ἐκ πολλ. προσώπ. as in διὰ πολλῶν; but there they are conceived of as those who *give thanks*, and in διὰ π. as those who have been *the procuring means of the thanksgiving*, in so far as *through their prayer they have aided in obtaining the apostle’s rescue*.² πρόσωπον, according to the use of the later Greek (see Lobeck, *ad Phryn.* p. 380; Schweigh., *Lex. Polyb.* p. 540; Wahl, *Clav. Apocr.* p. 430), is taken as *person* by Luther and most others (already in codd. of the Italic version). But it is nowhere used thus in the N. T., not even in passages like Jude 16; and, if Paul had had *person* in mind, there would have been no motive for choosing ἐκ instead of ὑπό. Hence we must abide by the literal signification, *countenance* (Billroth, Ewald, Osiander, Hofmann): the expression ἐκ πολλ. προσώπ. is *pictorial*, for on the merry countenance the feeling of gratitude is displayed (Prov. xv. 30); it is mirrored therein, and goes out from it and upward to God in the utterance of thanksgiving. (M³) Fritzsche, *ad Rom.* III. p. 53, in the

¹ Not the *apostolic office* (Ewald, Osiander), which here lies far from the context. So also Hofmann: the gift of God, to preach Christ to those who do not yet know Him. In the ordinary interpretation, there was not the least need of a demonstrative: the article and εἰς ἡμᾶς is from the context demonstrative enough.

² It was quite unsuitable, and contrary to the construction purposely carried out by the *correlata* stated above, to take ἐκ

πολλ. προσώπ. or διὰ πολλ. as *neuter*, and either to explain the former, *ex multis respectibus* (Bengel, comp. Melancthon—not even justifiable in the usage of the language), or the latter, *prolixe* (Castalio: “ingentes gratiae,” Wolf, Clericus, Semler, Storr, Rosenmüller). Comp. Luther. So also Hofmann takes διὰ πολλ. “*abundant thanksgiving*.” The Vulgate renders rightly: “per multos.”

same way rightly joins ἐκ πολλ. προσώπ. as well as διὰ πολλ. with εὐχαρ., but he takes ἐκ πολλ. πρ. of those who have besought the rescue and have thereby become the causers of the thanksgiving, and διὰ πολλῶν of the thanksgivers themselves. So also Neander. But by this view justice is not done to the *mediating* sense of διά, and the *pictorial* reference of προσώπων (see above) can, according to the text, be found only in the act of thanksgiving itself. It is obvious from what has already been said, that neither can διὰ πολλ. be joined to τὸ εἰς ἡμ. χάρισμα (Theophylact and others, Billroth, Olshausen, Osiander, Kling), nor can ἐκ πολλ. προσώπ. be connected with τὸ εἰς ἡμ. χάρ. as if it stood : τὸ ἐκ πολλ. προσώπ. εἰς ἡμᾶς χάρισμα (Ambrosiaster, Valla, Beza, Calvin, Grotius, Estius, and many others, including Flatt, Fritzsche, *Diss.*, Rückert, de Wette). Only on our view does the simple construction, as given by the order of the words, remain without dislocation, and the meaning of the words themselves uninjured. Whether, further, in ἐκ πολλ. προσώπ. the πολλῶν is *masculine* (Hofmann and Vulgate, “*ex multorum facie*”) or *neuter*, cannot be decided. — ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν] *on our behalf*, superfluous in itself, but suitable to the fulness of the representation.—The *time* in which the thanksgiving is to happen is after the beginning of the ῥύσεται, not on the last day (Ewald).—The passive expression εὐχαριστεῖσθαι (comp. Hipp. *Ep.* p. 1284, 31) is conceived like ἀχαριστεῖσθαι (Polyp. xxiii. 11. 8), to experience ingratitude, to be recompensed with ingratitude. Comp. Buttman, *neut. Gr.* p. 130 [E. T. 148].

Ver. 12. The apostle now begins the vindication of himself, at first in reference to the *purity of his walk in general* (ver. 12), then in reference to his *honesty in writing* (vv. 13, 14), and afterwards specially in reference to the changing of his plans for the journey (vv. 15–24). — γάρ] Ground assigned for the confidence uttered in ver. 11, that the readers would help him by their intercession in the manner denoted : *for we boast, according to the witness of our conscience, to have made ourselves worthy of your help*. — καύχησις is not equivalent to καύχημα, *materies gloriandi* (so most, but in no passage rightly, see on Rom. iv. 2), but we should interpret : *For this our boasting* (which is contained in ver. 11) *is the testimony which our conscience furnishes that we, etc.* In other words : *This our boasting is nothing else than the expression of the testimony of our conscience, that, etc.*; hence no αἰσχύνεσθαι ἀπὸ καυχήσεως (Isa. xii. 13) can take place. The contents of this testimony (ὅτι κ.τ.λ.) shows how very much the καύχησις of Paul is a *καυχᾶσθαι ἐν κυρίῳ* (1 Cor. i. 31). Accordingly, αὕτη is to be taken *together* with ἡ καύχησις ἡμῶν (comp. 1 Cor. viii. 9 : ἡ ἐξουσία ὑμῶν αὕτη); τὸ μαρτύριον κ.τ.λ. is the *predicate*, which is introduced by ἐστί, and ὅτι κ.τ.λ. is the *contents* of the testimony. By the plain simplicity of this explanation we obviously exclude the view that αὕτη is *preparative*, and that it is to be referred either to τὸ μαρτύριον (Luther and most), or, more harshly, with Hofmann, to ὅτι κ.τ.λ., because in that case τὸ μαρτύριον κ.τ.λ. is made an interpolated apposition. — ἐν ἀγιότητι (see the critical remarks) καὶ εἰλικρ. Θεοῦ] Θεοῦ is not used superlatively, as Emmerling would still take it. Further, it neither denotes *what is well-pleasing to God* (Schulz, Rosenmüller, Flatt, Rückert, Reiche), nor *what avails before God* (Calvin, Beza, Estius, Billroth, and others, following

Theophylact, nor *what is like God* (Pelagius), nor *the God-like* (Osiander), which is *God's manner* (Hofmann), but the moral holiness and purity *established by God* through the influence of the divine grace, as the following οὐκ ἐν σοφ. σαρκ., ἀλλ' ἐν χάριτι Θεοῦ proves.¹ So also Olshausen, de Wette, Kling, Neander, Winer, p. 221 [E. T. 296]. Comp. δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ, Rom. i. 17, εἰρήνη Θεοῦ, Phil. iv. 7, and the like. The rare word ἀγιότης is found also in 2 Macc. xv. 2 ; Heb. xii. 10 ; Schol. Arist. Thesm. 301. Regarding εἰλικρ., see on 1 Cor. v. 8. Stallbaum, *ad Plat. Phaed.* p. 66 A. — οὐκ ἐν σοφ. σαρκ. ἀλλ' ἐν χάρι. Θεοῦ] is not to be placed in a parenthesis, for it is parallel to the previous ἐν ἀγιότ. κ. εἰλικρ. Θεοῦ, and gives negative and positive information about it. The σοφία σαρκ. is the *merely human wisdom*, the wisdom which is not the work of the divine influence (of the Holy Spirit), but of human nature itself unenlightened and unimproved, guided by the sinful lust in the σάρξ. See on 1 Cor. i. 26. — ἐν χάριτι Θεοῦ] is not to be explained of *miracles* (Chrysostom), nor yet with Grotius : “cum multis donis spiritualibus,” but without any limitation of *the influence of the divine grace, under which Paul lived and worked*.—The thrice repeated use of ἐν denotes the spiritual element *in which* his course of life moved (Eph. ii. 3 ; 2 Pet. ii. 18). — ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ] *i.e.* among profane humanity. This serves by *contrast* to make the holiness of his walk and conversation *more prominent*. Comp. Phil. ii. 15. — πρὸς ὑμᾶς] denotes the direction of his association, *in intercourse with you*. See Bernhardt, p. 265. More than with others, he had established such a relation with the Corinthians (hence περισσοτ.).

Ver. 13 f. In order to vindicate the apparently vainglorious (ver. 10) περισσ. δὲ πρ. ὑμᾶς (ver. 12), in so far as it might be suspected as not honourably meant, he asserts his candour in writing, which must have been assailed by his opponents (comp. x. 10), who probably maintained, “His letters to us are not the expression of his genuine inmost opinion !” — *For nothing else do we write to you than what you* (in our letters) *read or also understand ; i.e.* in our letters to you we do not hide or disguise our genuine opinion, but it agrees exactly with what the reading of the same, or your acquaintance with our mode of thinking and character, says to you. Comp. Theodoret. On γράφειν in its reference to the *sense* of what is written, comp. 1 Cor. v. 11. According to de Wette, the sense amounts to the thought : “*I cannot do otherwise, I must write thus.*” But Paul is making an appeal to the readers. — ἀλλ' ἢ] *praeterquam, nisi*. For examples in which the previous negative sentence has also ἄλλος, see Hartung, *Partikell.* II. p. 45 ; Heindörf, *ad Prot.* p. 354 B ; Klotz, *ad Devar.* p. 36 f. ; Baeumlein, *Partik.* p. 5. The mode of expression depends on a *blending* of the two constructions—οὐκ ἄλλα . . . ἀλλά and οὐκ ἄλλα . . . ἢ ; Stallbaum, *ad Plat. Phaed.* p. 81 B ; Kühner, II. p. 438. — ἃ ἀναγινώσκετε, ἢ κ. ἐπιγ.] This latter ἢ is in no connection with the former, in which case it could not but have stood ἃ ἢ ἀναγ., ἢ καὶ ἐπιγ. This

¹ With this fall to the ground also the scruples of Rückert against the word ἀγιότητι, which he either wishes to take *abusive*, like the Latin *sanctitas, integrity*, or conjectures in its stead ἀγνότητι. Reiche's

difficulty regarding ἀγιότ., that Paul talks of his purity *as teacher*, is also untenable. He certainly speaks of his *entire conduct*, not *merely* of his teaching.

in opposition to Fritzsche's way of taking it : "neque enim alia ad vos perscribimus, quam aut ea . . . aut ea quae," etc. ἀναγινώσκειν is to *read*, as it is usually in the Attic authors, and always in the N. T., not to *understand*, as Calvin, Estius, Storr,¹ following the Peshito, wish to take it, though it has this meaning often in classical Greek (Hom. *Il.* xiii. 734, *Od.* xxi. 205, xxii. 206 ; Xen. *Anab.* v. 8. 6 ; Pind. *Isthm.* ii. 35 ; Herodian, vii. 7 ; comp. also Prayer of Manass. 12). — ἡ καὶ ἐπιγιν.] or also (without communication by letter) *understand*. Wetstein imports arbitrarily : "vel si alicubi haereat, post secundam aut tertiam lectionem, attento animo factam, sit intellecturus." Rückert : "and doubtless also understand." Quite against ἡ καὶ, which stands also opposed to the view of Hofmann : Paul wishes to say that he does not write in such a way, that they might understand something else than he means in his words. In this case we should have had καὶ only, since ἡ καὶ points to something *else* than to the reading, with which what he has written agrees. — The assimilation of the expressions ἀναγιν. and ἐπιγιν. (comp. iii. 2) cannot be imitated in German, but in Latin approximately : *legitis* aut etiam *intelligitis*. Comp. on Acts viii. 30 ; Plat. *Ep.* II. p. 312 D. — ἐλπίζω δέ κ.τ.λ.] The object to ἐπιγινώσεσθε is ὅτι καύχημα ὑμῶν ἐσμεν κ.τ.λ., and καθὼς καὶ ἐπέγν. ἡμ. ἀπὸ μέρ. is an inserted clause : "I hope, however, that you will understand even to the end,—as you have understood us in part,—that we are your boast," etc. We might also consider ὅτι καύχημα κ.τ.λ. as a nearer object to ἐπέγνωτε ὑμᾶς (Estius, Rosenmüller, Billroth, Rückert, de Wette) ; but, since in this way ἐπιγινώσεσθε remains without an object (Billroth supplies : "that I think the same as I write ;" comp. Rückert ; Osiander : "all my doing and suffering in its purity"), the above mode of connection is easier and simpler. Ambrosiaster, Luther, Grotius, and others, also Olshausen (Osiander doubtfully), take ὅτι as *for*, stating the ground for καθὼς κ. ἐπέγν. ἡμ. ἀπὸ μέρ. But in that case the accurate, logical connection is still more wanting, since from the *general* καύχημα ὑμῶν ἐσμεν κ.τ.λ. no inference to the ἐπέγνωτε ἡμᾶς *restricted* by ἀπὸ μέρους is warranted ; the reason assigned would not be suitable to ἀπὸ μέρους. The connection which runs on simply is unnecessarily broken up by Ewald holding ver. 13 and ver. 14 on to μέρους as a parenthesis, so that ὅτι, ver. 14 (*that*), joins on again to ver. 12. — ἕως τέλους] does not mean *till my death* (Hofmann), but *till the end*, i.e. till the ceasing of this world, till the Parousia. Comp. 1 Cor. i. 8, xv. 51 f. ; Heb. iii. 6. — Ver. 14. καθὼς κ. ἐπέγν. ἡμᾶς compares the future, regarding which Paul *hopes*, with the past, regarding which he *knows*. And therefore he adds a limitation in keeping with the truth, ἀπὸ μέρους (comp. Rom. xi. 25) ; for *not all* the Corinthians had thus understood him. Hofmann, quite against the usage of the language, takes ἀπὸ μέρους *of time*, inasmuch as the apostle's intercourse with them up to the present was only a part of what he had to live with them. In that case Paul would have written ἕως ἄρτι in contrast to ἕως τέλους. Calvin, Estius, and Emmerling refer it to the *degree* of knowledge, *quodammodo* (comp. ii. 5), with which Paul *reproaches* the readers,

¹ Calvin thinks ἀναγιν. and ἐπιγιν. are distinguished as *agnoscere* and *recognoscere*. So, on the whole, Storr also. But Estius

makes the difference : "et recognoscitis antiqua, et insuper etiam cognoscitis recentia."

ὥς μὴ παντελῶς ἀπωσαμένους τὰς κατ' αὐτοῦ γεγενημένας διαβολάς, Theodoret. But a purpose of reproach is quite foreign to the connection ; and certainly *the* readers to whom ἐπέγνωτε applies had not only understood him *quodammodo*, but wholly and decidedly, that, etc. Billroth thinks that Paul wishes to mark his cordial love, *which till now he could only have shown them in part*. Comp. Chrysostom, according to whom ἀπὸ μέρους is added from *modesty* ; also Theophylact, according to whom Paul is thinking of the imperfect exhibition of his *virtue*. But how could the readers conjecture this ! — ὅτι καύχημα κ.τ.λ.] *that we redound for glory* (i.e. for the object of *καυχᾶσθαι*) *to you, even as you to us on the day of the Parousia*. It will be to your honour on that day that you have had us as teachers, and it will be to our honour that we have had you as disciples. Comp. 1 Thess. ii. 19 f. ; Phil. ii. 16. With how much winning tact the addition *κάθαπερ κ. ὑμεῖς ἡμῶν* suppresses all appearance of self-exaltation ! ὥς μαθηταῖς ὁμοτίμοις διαλεγόμενος οὕτως ἐξισάζει τὸν λόγον, Chrysostom. — ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τ. κυρ. Ἰησοῦ] belongs to the whole ὅτι καύχημα . . . ὑμεῖς ἡμῶν, not, as Rückert arbitrarily thinks, to *καθάπερ κ. ὑμ. ἡμῶν* merely (so Grotius, Calovius, and others) ; nor yet, as Hofmann would have it, *primarily* to *καύχ. ὑμῶν ἐσμεν*.

Vv. 15, 16. Καὶ ταύτῃ τῇ πεποιθ.] *and in consequence of this confidence*, viz. ὅτι ἕως τέλους ἐπιγν. κ.τ.λ. in vv. 13, 14. πεποίθησις (iii. 4, viii. 22, x. 2 ; Eph. iii. 12 ; Phil. iii. 4 ; Joseph. *Bell.* i. 3. 1) is later Greek. See Eustathius, *ad Od.* iii. p. 114, 41 ; Thom. Mag. p. 717 ; Lobeck, *ad Phryn.* p. 294 f. — ἐβουλόμην] Paul entertained the plan for his journey, set down in ver. 16, before the composition of our first Epistle, and he had communicated it to the Corinthians (whether in the first letter now lost, or otherwise, we know not). But before or during the composition of our first Epistle he altered this plan (as we know from 1 Cor. xvi. 5) to this extent, that he was not now to go first to Corinth, then to Macedonia, and from thence back to Corinth again (ver. 16), but through Macedonia to Corinth. The plan of travel, 1 Cor. xvi. 5, was accordingly not the first (Baur) ; comp. Lange, *apost. Zeitalt.* I. p. 200 f.), but the one already altered, which alteration was ascribed to the apostle as indecision. This is intelligible enough from the antagonistic irritation of their minds, and does not require us to presuppose an expression in the alleged intermediate Epistle (Klöpffer, p. 21 f.). Chrysostom, Theodoret, and Oecumenius make the apostle say : I had, when I wrote to you 1 Cor. xvi. 5, the unexpressed intention to arrive still earlier than I promised, and to reach you even sooner (immediately on the journey towards Macedonia). Quite a mistaken view, since such a mere thought would not have been known to his opponents, and no excuse for his fickleness could therefore have been engrafted on it. — πρότερον] belongs to πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἐλθεῖν : ¹ I intended to come to you *first of all*,—not, as I afterwards altered my plan, to the Macedonians first, and then from them to you. Beza, Grotius, Bengel, and others, including Rosenmüller and Rückert, connect πρότ. and ἐβουλ., which, however, on the one hand is

¹ The position of πρότερον immediately after ἐβουλ. (Lachmann, Tischendorf, Rückert), which has preponderating evidence,

and is therefore to be preferred, makes no difference in this respect.

opposed to the sense (for Paul cannot say, "I intended formerly to come to you," since his intention is still the same), and on the other would not accord with ἵνα δευτ. χάρις. ἔχ.; for not the *πρότερον ἐβούλομην*, but the *πρότερον πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἐλθεῖν*, was to bring in its train a *δευτέρα χάρις*.—*ἵνα δευτέραν χάριν ἔχητε*] *δευτέραν* corresponds ingeniously to the *πρότερον*: *in order that you might have a second benefit of grace*. By *χάριν* is meant a *divine bestowal of grace*, with which Paul knew his coming to be connected for the church; for to whatever place he came in his official capacity, he came as the imparter of divine *χάρις*, Rom. i. 11; comp. xv. 29. Chrysostom, Oecumenius, and others, including Kypke, Emmerling, Flatt, and Bleek (in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1830, p. 622), hold that *χάρις* is equivalent to *χάρα* (and hence this is actually the reading of B L, some min., and Theodoret). Certainly *χάρις* also means *pleasure, joy*, and is, as in Tob. vii. 18, the opposite of *λύπη* (Eur. *Hel.* 661, and more frequently in Pindar; see Duncan, *Lex.*, ed. Rost, p. 1191; also in Plato, *Ast.* *Lex.* III. p. 538), but never in the N. T. This sense, besides, would be unsuitable to the apostle's delicate and modest style of expression elsewhere. Nor, again, is a *benefit on the part of the apostle* meant (Grotius, Rosenmüller, Schrader, Billroth, comp. also Hofmann), because the expression is only in keeping with his affection and humility (comp. 1 Cor. xv. 10) if a *divine* display of grace is meant. The comparison with 1 Cor. xvi. 3 is therefore not to the point, because there a *χάρις* is named, of which the *readers* were givers. But what does he mean by *δευτέραν χάριν*? Many answer with Estius: "ut ex secundo meo adventu secundam acciperetis gratiam, qui dudum accepistis primam, quando primum istuc veniens ad fidem vos converti." Comp. Pelagius, Calvin, Wolf, Mosheim, Bengel, Emmerling. But against this it may be urged: (1) historically, that Paul certainly had been already twice in Corinth before our two Epistles (see Introd. § 2); and (2) from the connection, that the *δευτέρα χάρις* in this sense can by no means appear as an aim conditioned by the *πρότερον*; for even a *later* coming would have had a *δευτέρα χάρις* in *this* sense as its result. This second reason is decisive, even if, with Schott, *Erörterung*, etc., p. 58 ff., and Anger, *rat. temp.* p. 72 f., we were to set aside the former by the supposition: "apostolum intra annum illum cum dimidio, quem, quum primum Corinthi esset, ibi transegit, per breve aliquod temporis spatium in regiones vicinas discessisse; sic enim si res se habuit, Paulus, etsi bis ad Corinthios venerat, ita ut in secunda, quam iis misit, epistola adventum *tertium* polliceri posset: tamen, quoniam per totum illud intervallum Corinthi potissimum docuerat, simile beneficium, quod in itinere seriore in eos collocaturus erat, jure *secundum* appellavit," Anger, *l.c.* p. 73. The right solution results from ver. 16, which is joined on by the epexegetical *καὶ*, viz., that the *δευτέρα χάρις* appears as setting in through the *πάλιν ἀπὸ Μακεδ. ἐλθεῖν πρὸς ὑμᾶς*. Paul had intended on his projected journey to visit Corinth *twice*, and had therefore proposed to himself to come to the Corinthians *first of all* (not first to the Macedonians), in order that they in this event might have a *second* *χάρις* on his return from Macedonia (the first *χάρις* they were to have on his journey thither). From this it is at once obvious: (1) how superfluous is the linguistically incorrect

supposition that δευτέραν is here equivalent to διπλῆν, as Bleek and Neander, following Chrysostom and Theodoret,¹ take it ; (2) how erroneous is the opinion of Rückert, that ἵνα δευτ. χάριν ἔχητε is put in a wrong place, and should properly only come behind ἐλθεῖν πρὸς ὑμᾶς, ver. 16. No ; according to the exegetical καί, ver. 16, δι' ὑμῶν ἀπελθεῖν εἰς Μακεδ. serves to give exact and clear information as parallel to the πρότερον πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἐλθεῖν, and then καὶ πάλιν ἀπὸ Μακ. ἐλθεῖν πρὸς ὑμᾶς as parallel to the ἵνα δευτέρ. χάριν ἔχητε. Comp. Baur, I. p. 338, ed. 2.

Ver. 17. *Wishing this therefore* (according to what has just been said), *did I then behave thoughtlessly?* Was this proposal of mine made without duly taking thought for its execution ? μήτι supposes a *negative* answer, as always, in which case ἄρα (meaning : *as the matter stands*) makes no alteration, such as the suggesting, perhaps, a thought of possible affirmation. Such a sense, as it were, of a mere tentative nature feeling its way, which is foreign here, could only be suggested by the context, and would have nothing to do with ἄρα (in opposition to Hartung, whom Hofmann follows). See Klotz, *ad Devar.* p. 176 f. — τῇ ἐλαφρίᾳ] The *article* marks the thoughtlessness not as that with which the apostle was reproached by the Corinthians (Billroth, Olshausen, Rückert, de Wette), which he must have indicated more precisely, in order that it might be so understood, but *thoughtlessness as such in general, in abstracto* : have I then made myself guilty of thoughtlessness ? ἐλαφρία belongs to the substantives in -ρία formed late from adjectives in -ρος. See Lobeck, *ad Phryn.* p. 343. For the *ethical* sense (wantonness), comp. Schol. *Aristoph. Av.* 195, and ἐλαφρός in Polyb. vi. 56. 11 ; ἐλαφρόνοος, Phocylides in Stob. *Flor.* app. iii. 7. — ἡ ἃ βουλεύομαι, κατὰ σάρκα βουλεύομαι] ἡ is not *aut* (Billroth, Rückert, Osiander, Hofmann, after the Vulgate and most expositors) but *an* ; for *without* any interrogation the relation of the two sentences is : *My proposal was not thoughtless, unless it should be the case that I form my resolves κατὰ σάρκα*. See Hartung, II. p. 61. — Mark the difference between ἐχρησάμην as *aurist* (historical event) and βουλεύομαι as *present* (behaviour generally). — κατὰ σάρκα] *according to the flesh*, after the standard of the σάρξ, *i.e.* so that I let myself be guided by the impulses of human nature sinfully determined, Gal. v. 16 ff. — ἵνα ἡ παρ' ἐμοὶ τὸ ναὶ ναὶ καὶ τὸ οὐ οὐ] By ἵνα is expressed simply the *immoral* purpose which would be connected with βουλεύεσθαι κατὰ σάρκα ; *in order that with me there may be the Yea, yea, and the Nay, nay, i.e.* in order that with me affirmation and denial may exist together ; that I, according as the case stands, may assent to the fleshly impulse, and in turn renounce it ; to-day yea, and to-morrow nay, or yea and nay as it were in one breath. Billroth errs in thinking that in this explanation καί must be taken as *also*. That it means *and*, is proved by vv. 18, 19. The *duplication* of the ναὶ and οὐ strengthens the picture of the untrustworthy man who affirms just as fervently as he afterwards denies.

¹ In other respects Theodoret, Bleek, and Neander, as also Billroth, Olshausen, and Rückert, agree in thinking that δευτέραν refers to the repeated visit to Corinth which had been intended after returning

from Macedonia. But Chrys., quite against the context, explains the double joy as καὶ τὴν διὰ τῶν γραμμάτων καὶ τὴν διὰ τῆς παρουσίας. So also Erasmus, Vatablus, and others.

Failing to discern this, Grotius and Estius wished to prefer the reading of the Vulgate, τὸ ναὶ καὶ τὸ οὐ, which has very weak attestation. The article marks the ναὶ ναί and the οὐ οὐ as well-known and solemn formulae of affirmative and negative asseveration (as they were also in *Jewish* usage ; see Wetstein, *ad Matth.* v. 37). Comp. on ναὶ ναί, Soph. *O. C.* 1743. As to the main point, namely, that the ναὶ ναί and the οὐ οὐ are taken as the subject of ἤ, this explanation has the support of Erasmus, Beza, Calvin, Estius (though conjecturing ἵνα μὴ instead of ἵνα), Cornelius à Lapide, Grotius, Mill, Wolf, and others ; also of Rosenmüller, Emmerling, Flatt, Schrader, Rückert, de Wette, Osiander, Neander, Maier, and others ; even Olshausen, who, however, sets up for ναί and οὐ the “peculiar” signification (assumed without any instance of its being so used) of “truth” and “falsehood.” The *diplasiasmus* ναὶ ναί and οὐ οὐ is not without reason (as Billroth and Hofmann object), but quite accords with the passionate excitement of the moral consciousness ; whereas afterwards, in ver. 18, where his words go on quietly with a glance towards the faithful God, the bare ναὶ καὶ οὐ is quite in its place. Note, further, that the simple expression of the *coexistence of the yea and nay* (to which Hofmann objects) is more *striking*, than if Paul had given a more precise explanation of the maxims of yea and nay. The readers knew him, and even his evil-wishers could not but know that he was no yea-and-nay man. Others consider the second ναί and the second οὐ as predicates, so that a wholly opposite sense is made out of the words : *in order that with me the Yea may be yea, and the Nay be nay, i.e.* in order that I may stubbornly carry through what I have proposed to myself. Comp. Jas. v. 12. So Chrysostom, Theodoret, Theophylact, Oecumenius, Erasmus, Castalio, Bengel, and others, and recently Billroth ; Winer, p. 429 [E. T. 576], gives no decision. The context, however, before (“*levitatis et inconstantiae, non autem pertinaciae crimen hic a se depellere studet,*” Estius) and after (vv. 18, 19), is decisive against this view. Hofmann imports into παρ’ ἐμοί a contrast to παρὰ τῷ Θεῷ, so that the idea would be : to assent to or refuse anything *on grounds taken from one’s own self*, without reservation, because purely as an *expression of self-will*, with which Jas. iv. 13 is compared.¹ Such a contrast could not but be based upon what went before, in itself as well as in the sense assumed. Besides, to this pretended emphasis on παρ’ ἐμοί the order ἵνα παρ’ ἐμοὶ ἤ would have been suitable ; and the idea of speaking no absolute yea or nay, would have demanded not καὶ but ἤ between the ναί and the οὐ. And was Paul, then, the man in whose resolves “the yea is always meant with the reservation of a nay” ? Luther’s translation (comp. Ambrosiaster and Erasmus) comes back to the result, that the mark of interrogation is placed after κατὰ σ. βουλ., and in that case there is supplied *nequaquam*, of which negation ἵνα κ.τ.λ. specifies the purpose. This is intolerably arbitrary. Regarding the erroneous translation of the Peshitto (Grotius agrees with it), which distorts the meaning from misconception, see Fritzsche, *Diss.* II. p. 2.

¹ Similarly Ewald, but he takes παρ’ ἐμοί (with Camerarius) as *penes me* (“merely after my own pleasure to say and to do the

one or the other”), as if, therefore, it were ἐν ἐμοί. Ewald compares Ps. xii. 5.

Ver. 18. *But according to His faithfulness, God causes our speech to you to be not yea and nay, not untrustworthy.*¹ The *δέ* introduces the contrast (*yea rather*) to the state of things *denied* in the preceding question (Baeumlein, *Partik.* p. 95) ; and *ὅτι* is equivalent to *εἰς ἐκεῖνο, ὅτι*, like John ii. 18, ix. 17, xi. 51 ; 1 Cor. i. 26, *al.* : *Faithful is God in reference to this, that our speech, etc., i.e. God shows Himself faithful by this, that, etc.* Beza, Calvin, and others, including Flatt, Rückert, de Wette, Oslander, Neander, Ewald, Hofmann, take *πιστὸς ὁ Θεός* as an asseveration : *proh Dei fidem!* Against all linguistic usage, for the *ζῶ ἐγὼ . . . ὅτι* (see on Rom. xiv. 11), which is compared, is a habitual formula of swearing, which the *πιστὸς ὁ Θεός*, very frequent with the apostle (1 Cor. i. 9, x. 13 ; 1 Thess. v. 24 ; 2 Thess. iii. 3 ; 1 John i. 9), is not. Nor can we compare xi. 10, where a *subjective* state of things is asserted as a guarantee of what is uttered. — *ὁ λόγος ἡμῶν*] is by most understood of the *preaching of the gospel*, according to which Paul thus, against the suspicion of untruthfulness in his resolves and assurances, puts forward the truthfulness of his preaching,—in which there lies a moral argument *a majori ad minus* ; for the opinion of Hofmann, that Paul means to say that his preaching stands in a *different* position from the *conditioned* quality of his yea and nay, falls with his view of ver. 17. From ver. 19, however, it appears to be beyond doubt that the usual explanation of *λόγος*, of the *preaching*, not in general of the apostle's *speech* (Rückert), or of that unfulfilled *promise* (Erasmus in the *Annot.*), is the right one. Olshausen mixes up the two explanations.

Vv. 19–22. Paul furnishes grounds in ver. 19 f. for the assurance he had given in ver. 18 ; then refers his veracity to the steadfastness bestowed on him by God, ver. 21 f. ; and finally, ver. 23, makes protestations as to the reason why he had not yet come to Corinth.

Ver. 19. *Ὁ γὰρ τοῦ Θεοῦ υἱός*] or, as Lachmann, Rückert, and Tischendorf, following preponderating testimony, have it rightly : *ὁ τοῦ Θεοῦ γὰρ υἱός* (*γάρ* in the *fourth* place ; see Fritzsche, *Quaest. Luc.* p. 100 ; Ellendt, *Lex. Soph.* I. p. 339 ; Hermann, *ad Philoct.* 1437), marks the *τοῦ Θεοῦ* as emphatic, in order to make what is to be said of Christ, *οὐκ ἐγένετο ναὶ κ. οὐ*, felt at once in its divine certainty. To be God's Son and yet *ναὶ κ. οὐ* would be a contradiction. In the whole *ὁ . . . Ἰ. X.* there lies a solemn, sacred emphasis. — *ὁ ἐν ὑμῖν δι' ἡμῶν κηρυχθείς*] reminds the readers of the *first* preaching of Christ among them, of which Paul *could not but* remind them, if they were to become perfectly conscious, from their experience from the beginning, that Christ had not become *ναὶ κ. οὐ*. But in order to make this *first* preaching come home to them with the whole personal weight of the preachers, he adds, in just consciousness of the services rendered by himself and his companions as compared with the later workers, a more precise definition of the *δι' ἡμῶν*, with more weighty circumstantiality : *δι' ἐμοῦ κ. Σιλουανοῦ κ. Τιμοθέου*. For the two latter had been his helpers in his first labours in Corinth. See Acts xviii. 5. From this it is obvious why he has not

¹ Erasmus says aptly, *Paraphr.* : “Sed non fallit Deus, cujus praesidio factum est, ut sermo noster, quo vobis illius evangelium

praedicavimus, non vacillarit, sed semper sui similis fuerit.”

named others, as Apollos, but simply these (Calvin thinks, that these had been most *calumniated*) ; hence also there is no need to suppose any intention of making his assurance more *credible* (Chrysostom, Theophylact, and many others). A side glance at the Christ preached by Judaistic opponents (xi. 4) is here quite foreign to the connection (in opposition to Klöpper, p. 86 f.). — Σιλωναοῦ] Universally so with Paul (1 Thess. i. 1 ; 2 Thess. i. 1) ; also in 1 Pet. v. 12. In the Acts of the Apostles only the shortened name Σιλας appears. Silvanus is here *placed before* Timothy, because he was an older apostolic helper than the latter. See Acts xv. 22 ff. — οὐκ ἐγένετο ναὶ κ. οὐ] *He has not become affirmation and negation, has not showed Himself as untrustworthy, as one who affirms and also denies* (the fulfilment of the divine promises, ver. 20), as one who had exhibited such contradiction in himself. This Paul says of *Christ Himself*, in so far as in the personal objective Christ, by means of his appearance and His whole work, the *ναί* in reference to the divine promises, the affirmation of their fulfilment, is given as a *matter of fact*. Wrongly most expositors (comp. Chrysostom, Theodoret, Theophylact) understand Χριστός as *doctrina de Christo* ("our gospel of Christ is not changeable, sometimes one thing, sometimes another, but it remains ever the same"), an interpretation here specially precluded by verses 20 and 21. This may be urged also against the similar interpretation of Hofmann, that, with the very fact that Christ has come to the readers *through preaching*, there has gone forth a *Yea* (the affirmation of all divine promises), without any intervention of *Nay*. Olshausen and Rückert take it rightly of Christ Himself ; but the former puts in place of the simple meaning of the word the thought not quite in keeping : "Christ is the absolute truth, *affirmation pure and simple* ; in Him is the real fulfilment of the divine promises ; in Him *negation* is entirely wanting ;" and the latter arbitrarily limits ἐγένετο merely to the experience of the Corinthians ("among you He has not shown Himself untrustworthy"). Paul, however, uses the words οὐκ ἐγένετο ναὶ κ. οὐ of Christ in general, and by ὁ ἐν ὑμῖν . . . Τιμοθ. directs the attention of the Corinthians to the recognition of the truth on their part and out of their own experience. — ἀλλὰ ναὶ ἐν αὐτῷ γέγονεν] of the two only the former, *i.e. affirmation* (that the divine promises are fulfilled and shall be fulfilled) *is established in Him* : in Christ is actually given the *yea*, that, etc. In the perfect γέγονεν (different from the previous aorist ἐγένετο) is implied the *continuance* of what has happened. Comp. on Col. i. 16 ; John i. 3. Grotius, in opposition to the context (see ver. 20), referred ναὶ ἐν αὐτῷ γέγ. to the *miracles*, by which Christ confirmed the apostolic preaching. And Beza awkwardly, and, on account of ver. 20, erroneously, took ἐν αὐτῷ of *God*, whose Son is "*constantissima Patris veritas*."

Ver. 20. A more precise explanation and confirmation of ναὶ ἐν αὐτῷ γέγονεν, running on to the end of the verse. Hence ὅσαι . . . ἀμήν is not to be put in a parenthesis, as Griesbach, Scholz, and Ewald.—τὸ ναί and τὸ ἀμήν cannot be synonymous, as most of the older commentators take them (*repetit, ut ipsa repetitione rem magis confirmet*," Estius), for this is rendered impossible by the correct reading διὰ κ. δι' αὐτοῦ τὸ ἀμήν (see the critical remarks). Rather must the former be the cause (διὰ) of the latter. And here

the expression τὸ ἀμήν is without doubt to be explained from the custom in worship, that in public prayer a general Amen was said as certifying the general assurance of faith as to its being heard (see on 1 Cor. xiv. 16). Accordingly τὸ ναί and τὸ ἀμήν are here to be distinguished in this way ; τὸ ναί, as in the whole context, denotes *the certainty objectively given* (comp. on that point, Rom. xv. 8), and τὸ ἀμήν, *the certainty subjectively existing, the certainty of faith*. Consequently : *for, as many promises of God as there are* (in the O. T.), *in Him is the yea* (in Christ is given the objective guarantee of their fulfilment) ; *therefore through Him also the Amen takes place*, therefore it comes to pass through Christ, that the Amen is said to God's promises ; *i.e. therefore also to Christ*, to His work and merit, without which we should want this certainty, *is due the subjective certainty of the divine promises, the faith in their fulfilment*. Billroth, indeed (and in the main, de Wette), thinks the conception to be this : that *the preachers of the gospel* say the Amen through their preaching, so that τὸ ναί refers to the living working of God in Christ, in whom He fulfils His promises, and τὸ ἀμήν to the faithful and steadfast preaching of these deeds of God. But the saying of Amen expressed the assurance of faith, and was done by *all* ; hence τὸ ἀμήν would be in the highest degree unsuitable for denoting the *praedicatio*. Finally, Rückert is quite arbitrary when he says that τὸ ναί relates to the fulfilment of the prophecies wrought by the appearing of Christ Himself, and τὸ ἀμήν to the *erection of the church, which had grown out of that appearing*.—The article before ναί and ἀμήν denotes the *definite* Yea and Amen, which relate to the ἐπαγγελίαι Θεοῦ and belong to them. The article was not used before in ver. 19, because no definite reference of the yea was yet specified. — τῷ Θεῷ πρὸς δόξαν δι' ἡμῶν] a teleological definition to δι' αὐτοῦ τὸ ἀμήν with the emphatic prefixing of τῷ Θεῷ : *to God's honour through us, i.e. what redounds to the glorifying of God* (viii. 19) *through us*. — δι' ἡμῶν] *nostro ministerio* (Grotius), in so far, namely, as the ministry of the gospel-preachers brings about the Amen, the assurance of faith in God's promises, Rom. x. 14.

Ver. 21 f. Δέ] not specifying the ground of τῷ Θεῷ πρὸς δόξαν (Grotius), nor confirming the assurance that he had preached without wavering (Billroth), but *continuative*. Paul has just, with δι' ἡμῶν, pointed to the blessed result which his working (and that of his companions) is bringing about, namely, that the Amen of faith is said to all God's promises to the glory of God. But now he wishes to indicate also the inner divine life-principle, on which this working and its result are based, namely, the *Christian steadfastness*, which is due to no other than to God Himself. — On the construction, comp. v. 5 ; hence Billroth (whom Olshausen follows) has incorrectly taken ὁ δὲ βεβαιῶν . . . Θεός as subject, and ὁ καὶ σφραγ. κ.τ.λ. as predicate. It is to be translated : “ *And He who makes us steadfast with you toward Christ, after He has also anointed us, is God ; who also,*” etc. Since the anointing precedes the βεβαιῶν, and is its foundation, and Paul has not written ὁ δὲ χρίσας ἡμᾶς καὶ βεβαιῶν κ.τ.λ., it is not to be regarded with the expositors as *qui autem confirmat et unxit*, but καὶ χρίσας ἡμᾶς is to be taken as a definition subordinate to the βεβαιῶν, and καὶ as the *also* of the corresponding relation ; otherwise, there would be a hysteron-proteron, which

there is no ground for supposing. — εἰς Χριστόν *in relation to Christ*, so that we remain unshakenly faithful to Christ. Chrysostom well says : ὁ μὴ ἔων ἡμᾶς παρασαλεύεσθαι ἐκ τῆς πίστεως τῆς εἰς τ. Χριστόν. The explanation : *into Christ* (Billroth, Olshausen) has against it the *present* participle. For the believers are already *in Christ* ; their continued confirmation (βεβ., see on 1 Cor. i. 6) therefore could not but take place *in Christo*, Col. ii. 7, not *in Christum*. — σὺν ὑμῖν] Paul adds, in order not to appear as if he were denying to the readers the βεβαίωσις εἰς Χριστόν. Estius says aptly : “ut eos in hac sua defensione benevolos habeat.” This agrees with the whole tone of the context ; but there is not, as Rückert conjectures, a side glance at those who had held the apostle to be a wavering reed. — χρίσας ἡμᾶς] here, without σὺν ὑμῖν, is a figurative way of denoting the *consecration to office* (Luke iv. 18 ; Acts iv. 27, x. 38 ; Heb. i. 9), *i.e.* to the *office of teacher of the gospel*, without, however, pressing the expression so far as Chrysostom and Theophylact : ὁμοῦ προφήτας καὶ ἱερεῖς κ. βασιλέας ἐργασάμενος. Whether, however, did Paul conceive the consecration as effected *by the call* (Billroth, Olshausen, Rückert) or by the *communication of the Spirit* (Calvin, Grotius, Estius, Osiander, and many others, following the ancient expositors) ? Ver. 22 is not opposed to the latter view (see below) ; and since the call to the office is, in point of fact, something quite different from the consecration, χρίσας is certainly to be referred to the holy consecration of the Spirit (comp. Acts x. 38). Comp., further, 1 John ii. 20, 27, and Düsterdieck on 1 John i. p. 355. An allusion to Χριστόν (Bengel, Osiander, Hofmann, and others) would not be certain, even if there stood καὶ χρίσας καὶ ἡμᾶς, because Χριστόν is not used appellatively, but purely as a proper name. An *anointing* of Christ (as at Luke iv. 18 ; Acts iv. 27, x. 38 ; Heb. i. 9) is as little mentioned by Paul as by John. If, however, it had been here in his mind, in order to compare with it the consecration of the ἡμεῖς, he could not but have added σὺν αὐτῷ, or some similar more precise definition of the relation intended, to make himself intelligible ; comp. the idea of the συζωποιεῖν σὺν Χριστῷ, and the like. — ὁ καὶ σφραγισ. ὑμᾶς κ.τ.λ.] is argumentative. How could He leave us in the lurch unconfirmed, *He, who has also sealed us*, etc. ! How would He come into contradiction with Himself ! This σφραγισ. ὑμᾶς does not present the same thing, as was just expressed by χρίσας ἡμ., *in another figurative form* ; but by means of καί it adds an *accessory new element*,¹ namely, the *Messianic sealing* conferred, although likewise through the Holy Spirit (see the sequel), apart from the anointing, *i.e.* the inner confirmation of the Messianic σωτηρία. Comp. on Eph. i. 13, iv. 30. It is not added to what the sealing objectively relates (to the Messianic salvation), because it is regarded as a *familiar* notion, *well known* in its reference. — καὶ δούς κ.τ.λ.] is exegetical of ὁ σφραγισάμ. ἡμᾶς, Winer, p. 407 [E. T. 545]. — τὸν ἀρραβῶνα τοῦ πνεύματος] Comp. v. 5. The *genitive* is the genitive of *apportion*, as 1 Cor. v. 8 : *the earnest-money, which consists in the Spirit*. ἀρραβῶν (also with the Romans *arrhabo* or *arrha*) is properly ἡ ἐπὶ ταῖς ὥραις παρὰ τῶν

¹ Hence καί is to be taken as *also*, not with the following καί, as *well . . . as also* ; es-

pecially as καὶ σφραγ. and καὶ δούς are not two acts essentially different.

ὄνουνμένων δεδομένη προκαταβολή ὑπὲρ ἀσφαλείας, Etym. M. ; Aristot. *Pol.* i. 4. 5 ; Lucian, *Rhet. praec.* 17, 18. Then it is a figurative expression for the notion *guarantee*. See in general Wetstein, and especially Kypke, *Obs.* II. p. 239 f. *For what* the Holy Spirit is guarantee, Paul does not say, but he presupposes it as an obvious fact in the consciousness of the readers, just as he did with σφραγισάμ. The Holy Spirit is in the heart as an earnest-money given for a guarantee of a future possession, *the pledge of the future Messianic salvation*. Comp. v. 5 ; Eph. i. 14. How ? see Rom. viii. 2, 10 f., v. 5, viii. 15 ff. ; Gal. iv. 6 f. ; Eph. v. 19. In ἀρραβ., therefore, the climax τῶν μελλόντων ἀγαθῶν (Theodoret) is characteristic. — ἐν ταῖς καρδιαῖς ἡμ.] The direction is blended with the result, as viii. 1 : *He gave the Spirit, so that this Spirit is now in our hearts*. Comp. viii. 16, and on John iii. 35.

Ver. 23. After Paul has vindicated himself (vv. 16–22) from the suspicion of fickleness and negligence raised against him on account of his changing the plan of his journey, he proceeds in an elevated tone to give, with the assurance of an oath (xi. 31 ; Rom. i. 9 ; Gal. i. 20), *the reason why* he had not come to Corinth. — ἐγὼ δέ] Hitherto he has spoken *communicativè*, not talking of himself exclusively. Now, however, to express his own self-determination, he continues : *but I for my own part*, etc.—For examples of ἐπικαλεῖσθαι τὸν Θεὸν μάρτυρα, see Wetstein. Comp. Hom. *Il.* xxii. 254. Θεοὺς ἐπιδώμεθα τοὶ γὰρ ἄριστοι μάρτυροι ἔσσονται, Plat. *Legg.* ii. p. 664 C. — ἐπὶ τ. ἡμ. ψυχ.] not : *against my soul*, in which case it would be necessary arbitrarily to supply *si fallo* (Grotius ; comp. Osiander and others, also Ernesti, *Urspr. d. Sünde*, II. p. 102), but, *in reference to (for) my soul*, “in qua rerum mearum mihi conscius sum, quam perimi nolim,” Bengel. It expresses the moral reference of the invocation, and belongs to ἐπικαλ., in which act Paul has in view that he thereby stakes the salvation (Heb. x. 39 ; 1 Pet. i. 9 ; Jas. i. 21) or ruin of his soul (Rom. ii. 9). Comp. the second commandment. — φειδόμενος ὑμ.] *exercising forbearance towards you*. This was implied in the very fact of his not coming. Had he come, it must have been ἐν ῥαβδῳ, 1 Cor. iv. 21. Comp. ii. 1. — οὐκέτι] *not again*, as would have accorded with my former plan, ver. 16.¹ But since this former plan is altered already in 1 Cor. xvi. 5 f., the ἔτι in οὐκέτι must refer to a visit *preceding* our first Epistle. εἰς Κόρινθον] “elegantè pro *ad vos* in sermone potestatem ostendente,” Bengel.

Ver. 24. Guarding against a possible misunderstanding of φειδόμενος. Theodoret says aptly : τοῦτο δὲ ὡς ὑφορμοῦν τέθεικεν ; for the expression φειδόμενος might be interpreted as a pretension to lordship over faith. — οὐχ ὅτι] is equivalent to οὐκ ἐρῶ, ὅτι. See on John vi. 46, and Tyrwhitt, *ad Arist. Poet.* p. 128. — κυριεύομεν κ.τ.λ.] The apostle knows that no *lordship* over *faith* belongs to him ; how the faith in Christ is to be shaped among the churches as respects contents, vital activity, etc., he has not to *command*, as if he were *lord* over it, but only to teach, to rouse, and entreat (v. 20) there-

¹ [The phrase is excellently well rendered in the Revised N. T., “I forbore to come.”—T. W. C.]

to, to promote it by praise or blame, etc. The *order* κυρ. ὑμῶν τ. πίστ. depends on the form of conception : *we do not lord it over you as to faith*. Comp. on John xi. 32, and Stallbaum, *ad Plat. Symp.* p. 117 A, *Rep.* p. 518 C. This prefixing of the pronoun occurs very often in the N. T. ; hence it was the more preposterous to supply a *ἐνεκα* before τῆς πίστ. (Erasmus, Calvin, Estius, Flatt, and others). — ἀλλὰ συνεργοί] *but* (it is implied in my φειδόμενος ὑμῶν) *that we are joint helpers of your joy*, that it is our business to be helpful to you, so that you rejoice. To this destined aim an earlier coming would have been opposed, because it would have *caused grief* (ii. 1). The *συν* in *συνεργοί* refers to the union of the helping efficacy with the working of the Corinthians themselves. Contrary to the context, Grotius suggests : “ cum Deo et Christo,” which Osiander also imports. The *χαρά* is not to be taken of the joy of *blessedness* (Grotius and others), but of the joy of the church *over the improvement and the success of the Christian life amongst them*. Only this agrees with the context, for the want of this success had been the cause of Paul's formerly coming ἐν λύπῃ to the Corinthians and of the necessity for his coming again ἐν ῥάβδῳ (1 Cor. iv. 21). — τῇ γὰρ πίστει ἐστήκατε] *for in respect to faith ye stand* ; the point of faith, in respect to which you are firm and stedfast, is not now under discussion. (P³) Note the emphatic placing of τῇ πίστ. first. Theophylact well says : οὐκ οὖν ἐν τούτοις (τοῖς κατὰ πίστιν) εἶχον τι μέμψασθαι ὑμᾶς· ἐν ἄλλοις δὲ ἐσαλεύεσθε. On the dative of more precise definition, comp. Polyb. xxi. 9. 3 ; Rom. iv. 19, 20 ; Gal. v. 1 (Elzevir). It does not mean *per fidem*, Rom. xi. 20, as Bengel and Hofmann hold (through faith you have an independent and firm Bearing), in which case we should have for ἐστήκ. a very vague and indefinite conception ; but it is, in substance, not different from ἐν τῇ πίστει, 1 Cor. xvi. 13.

NOTES BY AMERICAN EDITOR.

(GG³) “ *The Father of mercies.*” Ver. 3.

On this expression, Stanley makes the unwarrantable remark that it combines the two ideas that God's essence consists in mercy, and also that He is the father and the source of mercies. Neither of these ideas is in the words. For the genitive is not that of source or effect, but of quality, as Meyer affirms, so that the phrase gives us the conception of God as a being whose characteristic is mercy ; but this is a very different thing from the crude and flabby notion that His essence consists in mercy. For, if that be so, what becomes of the other perfections which reason and Scripture compel us to attribute to Him ?

(HH³) *That we may be able to comfort.* Ver. 4.

Paul was willing to be afflicted in order to be the bearer of consolation to others. A life of ease is commonly stagnant. It is those who suffer much and who experience much of the comfort of the Holy Ghost who live much. Their life is rich in experience and resources (Hodge).

(I³) “*The sufferings of Christ in us.*” Ver. 5.

This means, as Meyer states, not sufferings on account of Christ, nor those which He endures in His members, but such sufferings as Christ endured, and which His people are called upon to endure in virtue of their union with Him. It is not enough simply to say that it is of the very nature of spiritual things that they cannot be confined within themselves. It is a more specific truth the Apostle has in view, viz. that as union with Christ was the source of His afflictions, so it was the source of His abundant consolation.

(J³) *The reason of Paul's affliction and his comfort.* Vv. 6, 7.

The order of the words in these verses is well given in the Revision of 1881. The general sense is plain. If the Apostle was afflicted, it was for the salvation of others; if he was comforted, it was for their comfort. In this twofold sense they were joint partakers in his joys and his sorrows.

(K³) “*The sentence of death.*” Ver. 9.

The Revised N. T. begins this verse with *Yea* instead of *But* (so Stanley and Principal Brown), which certainly seems more vivid. Meyer's objection is hardly tenable.—The Revised rendering *answer* of the first noun, now generally adopted, is wonderfully expressive and emphatic. It means, “Whenever I have put to myself the question, What will be the issue of this continuous conflict? the answer has been, Death.”

(L³) “*And doth deliver.*” Ver. 10.

Westcott and Hort as well as Tischendorf adopt the future reading, “and will deliver,” which is given also in the Revised N. T. This reading is best sustained externally, but the internal evidence is all the other way. It is a precious assurance that God did, does, and will deliver, as the three tenses of the common reading declare.

(M³) “*From many countenances.*” Ver. 11.

A graphic picture is given in this phrase, “from many (upturned) faces,” as of men looking up to God in prayer and praise. Meyer's view is sustained, as he shows, by the invariable usage of the New Testament.

(N³) *As God is faithful.* Ver. 18.

Meyer's objection to this rendering has weight, yet his own is far from being unimpeachable. It paraphrases the passage rather than translates it, and is certainly constrained and awkward. Whereas the other gives a noble sense: “As God is true, my preaching is true.” Paul's confidence in the truth of the Gospel as he proclaimed it was one and the same with his confidence in God. To tell him that it was not to be depended upon was all the same in his mind with saying that God was not to be believed.

(O³) *Anointing, sealing, earnest.* Ver. 22.

The first of these words cannot refer to official chrism, but must denote the unction common to all Christians (1 John, ii. 20). The second denotes the

authentication and preservation of believers, a seal being used both to prove genuineness and to maintain inviolate. The third is unusually strong, indicating that the indwelling of the Spirit here and now is an instalment, a first-fruits of what is to come, and so a very special pledge of its certain attainment.

(P³) “*By faith ye stand.*” Ver. 24.

Stanley gives the sense thus : “ We are but co-operators with you in producing not your grief, but your joy : and so far from our being the masters of your faith, it is by your faith that you stand independently of us.”

CHAPTER II.

Ver. 1. *πάλιν ἐν λύπῃ πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἐλθεῖν*] Elz. : *πάλιν ἐλθεῖν ἐν λύπῃ πρὸς ὑμᾶς*, in opposition to A B C K L $\aleph$, min. Theodoret, Damasc., also in opposition to D E F G, 14, 120, *al.*, Syr. Arm. Vulg. It. Chrys. Theophyl. and the Latin Fathers, who have *πάλιν ἐν λύπῃ ἐλθεῖν πρὸς ὑμᾶς* (so Tisch.). The *Recepta*¹ is evidently a transposition to connect *πάλιν* with *ἐλθεῖν*, because it was supposed that Paul had been only *once* in Corinth. — Ver. 2. *ἐστὶν* after *τίς* is wanting in A B C $\aleph$, Copt. Syr. Cyr. Dam. Lachm. Tisch. Supplemental addition. — Ver. 3. *ὑμῖν*] after *ἔγρ.* is to be struck out as an explanatory addition. So Lachm. and Tisch., who follow A B C* $\aleph$ * 17, Copt. Arm. Damasc. Ambrosiast. — Ver. 3. *λύπην*] D E F G, min. Vulg. It. Syr. p. Pel. Beda : *λύπην ἐπὶ λύπην*. Amplification, in accordance with ver. 1. — Ver. 7. *μᾶλλον*] is wanting in A B, Syr. Aug. (deleted by Rückert). In D E F G, Theodoret, it stands only after *ὑμᾶς*. As it was superfluous, it was sometimes passed over, sometimes transposed. — Ver. 9. Instead of *εἰ*, A and B have *ἦ*. But how easily might *εἰ* be dropped before *εἰς* (so in 80), and then be variously replaced (109 : *ὥς*)! — Ver. 10. *ὁ κεχάρισμαι, εἰ τι κεχάρισμαι*] So A B C F G $\aleph$, min. Vulg. It. Damasc. Jer. Ambrosiast. Pacian. Pel. Griesb. Scholz, Lachm. Rück. Tisch. But Elz. has *εἰ τι κεχάρισμαι, ᾧ κεχάρισμαι*, defended by Reiche. This reading arose from the Codd., which read (evidently in accordance with the previous *ᾧ*) *ᾧ κεχάρισμαι, εἰ τι κεχάρισμαι* (so still D*** E, 31, 37). The repetition of *κεχάρισμαι* caused the *εἰ τι κεχ.* to be left out;² afterwards it was restored at a wrong place. — Ver. 16. Before *θανάτου* and before *ζωῆς* there stands *ἐκ* in A B C $\aleph$, min. Copt. Aeth. Clem. Or. and other Fathers. Rightly; the *ἐκ* seemed contrary to the sense, and was therefore omitted. Accepted by Lachm. and Tisch., rejected by Reiche. — Ver. 17. *οἱ πολλοί*] D E F G L, min. and some versions and Fathers have *οἱ λοιποί*, which Mill favoured, Griesbach recommended, and Reiche defended. But *οἱ πολλοί* has preponderating evidence; *λοιποί* was a modifying gloss, and displaced the other. — *κατενώπιον*] *κατέναντι*, as well as the omission of the following article, has preponderating attestation, and hence, with Lachm. and Rück., it is to be preferred.

Vv. 1–4. Continuation of what was begun in i. 23.

Ver. 1. *Ἐκρίνα δὲ ἐμὰντῷ τοῦτο*] *δέ* is the usual *μεταβατικόν*, which leads on from the assurance given by Paul in i. 23, to the thought that he *in his own interest* (*ἐμὰντῷ*, *dativus commodi*; for see ver. 2) was not willing to come again to them *ἐν λύπῃ*. (*Q*³) — The interpretation *apud me* (Vulgate, Luther, Beza, and many others) would require *παρ' ἐμὰντῷ* or *ἐν ἐμ.* (1 Cor. vii. 37; xi. 13). Paul, by means of *ἐμὰντῷ*, gives to the matter an ingenious, affection-

¹ Which, perhaps, has *no* authorities at all; see Reiche, *Comm. Crit.* I. p. 355 f.

² Also with the reading *ὅ* this omission of

the copyist took place, as still 39, 73, Aeth. Ambr. have merely *ὁ κεχάρισμαι*.

ate turn, regarding the truth of which, however, there is no doubt. — ἐκρίνα] *I determined*, as 1 Cor. ii. 2, vii. 27. As to the emphatically preparatory τοῦτο with following infinitive accompanied by the article, comp. on Rom. xiv. 13, and Krüger, § li. 7. 4. — πάλιν] belongs to ἐν λύπῃ πρὸς ὑμ. ἐλθεῖν, *taken together*, so that Paul had once already (namely, on his second arrival) come to the Corinthians ἐν λύπῃ. The connection with ἐλθεῖν merely (Pelagius, Primasius, Theodoret, and the most ; also Flatt, Baur, Reiche), a consequence of the error that Paul before our Epistles had been only *once* in Corinth,¹ is improbable even with the *Recepta* (the more suitable order of the words would be : τὸ μὴ ἐν λύπῃ πάλιν ἐλθεῖν πρὸς ὑμᾶς), but is impossible both with our reading and with that of Tischendorf (see the critical remarks), unless we quite arbitrarily suppose, with Grotius (comp. also Reiche), a *trajectio*, or, with Baur, I. p. 342, an inaccuracy of epistolary style. — ἐν λύπῃ] *provided with affliction* (Bernhardy, p. 109 ; comp. Rom. xv. 29), *bringing affliction with me*, i.e. *afflicting you*. This explanation (Theodoret, Calvin, Grotius, and others, including Ewald) is, indeed, held by Hofmann to be impossible in itself, but is required by the following εἰ γὰρ ἐγὼ λυπῶ ὑμᾶς. Hence Billroth and Hofmann, following Chrysostom and many others, are wrong in thinking that *the apostle's* own sadness is meant ; and so also Bengel, Olshausen, Rückert, de Wette, Reiche, Neander, following Ambrosiaster, and others, who think that it is also included. That it is *not* meant *at all*, is shown by φειδόμενος, i. 23, and by the coupling of what follows with γάρ. Comp. ἐν ῥάβδῳ, 1 Cor. iv. 21. The apparent difficulty, that Paul in our first Epistle makes no mention whatever of the fact and manner of his former visit to Corinth when he caused affliction, is obviated by the consideration that only after our first Epistle was the change of plan used to the apostle's disadvantage, and that only now was he thereby compelled to mention the earlier arrival which had been made ἐν λύπῃ. Hence this passage is not a proof for the assumption of a journey to Corinth *between* our two Epistles (see the Introd.).

Ver. 2. As *reason* for his undertaking not to come to his readers again ἐν λύπῃ, Paul states that he on his own part could not in this case hope to find any joy among them. Comp. ver. 3. *For if I afflict you, who is there also to give me joy, except him who is afflicted by me?*—i.e., if I on my part (ἐγὼ is emphatic²) make you afflicted, then results the contradiction that the very one who is afflicted by me is the one who should give me joy. Against this view Billroth and Rückert object that εἰ μὴ . . . ἐμοῦ is superfluous, and even in the way. No ; it discloses the absurdity of the case conditioned by εἰ ἐγὼ

¹ This error has compelled many to get out of the difficulty by conceiving our first Epistle as the first coming ἐν λύπῃ. So Chrysostom, Calvin, Beza, Bengel, and others. Lange, *Apostol. Zeitait.* I. p. 204, believes that he has found another way : that Paul had the very first time come to Corinth in affliction (1 Cor. ii. 1 ff.), which affliction *he had brought with him from Athens*. As if in 1 Cor. ii. 1 ff. he is speaking

of a λύπη ! and as if a λύπη brought with him from *Athens*, though nowhere proved, would have anything to do with the *Corinthians* !

² This emphasis is usually not recognized. But in the ἐγὼ there lies a contrast to *others* who do not stand in such an intimate relation to the readers as Paul. Comp. Oslander.

λυπῶ ὑμᾶς. Pelagius, Bengel, and others, including Billroth, render : *who yet so much gladdens me as he who lets himself be afflicted by me* (which is a sign of amendment) ? Comp. Chrysostom, and Theodoret, Erasmus, and others. So also Olshausen, who sees here an indirect warning to take the former censure more to heart. But against this perversion of ὁ λυπούμενος in a middle sense, we may decisively urge :—(1) that the sense of ver. 2 would not stand in any relation to ver. 1 as furnishing a reason for it ; and (2) the οὐχ ἵνα λυπηθῇτε in ver. 4. Rückert sees in εἰ . . . ὑμᾶς an aposiopesis ; then begins a new question, which contains the reason why he may not afflict them, because it would be unloving, nay, ungrateful, to afflict those who cause him so much joy. Hence the meaning, touchingly expressed, is : “I might not come to you afflicting you ; for if I had done so, I should have afflicted just those who give me joy : this would have been unloving on my part.” This is all the more arbitrary, since, logically at least, it must have stood in the converse order : καὶ τίς ἐστὶν ὁ λυπούμενος ἐξ ἐμοῦ εἰ μὴ ὁ εὐφραίνων με. Hofmann holds still more arbitrarily and oddly that εἰ γάρ is elliptical protasis, and ἐγὼ λυπῶ ὑμᾶς apodosis : *if I come to you again in affliction, I make you afflicted, and who is there then who gladdens me, except him whom affliction coming from me befalls ?* The well-known omission of the verb in the protasis after εἰ is, in fact, a usage of quite another nature (see Hartung, *Partikell.* II. p. 213 ; Stallbaum, *ad Plat. Rep.* p. 497 ; Krüger, § lxxv. 5. 11). Besides, this subtlety falls with Hofmann’s view of ver. 1. — καὶ] *also*, expresses after the conditional clause the *simultaneousness* of what is contained in the apodosis, consequently without the interrogative form : there is *also no one*, etc. See Hartung, *Partikell.* I. p. 130 f. ; Buttmann, *neut. Gramm.* p. 311 [E. T. 362]. — ὁ λυπούμενος] does not mean the *incestuous person* (so, against the entire connection, Beza, Calovius, Cornelius à Lapide, Heumann) ; but the singular of the participle with the article denotes the one who gives joy, *as such, in abstracto*. Comp. 1 Pet. iii. 13, *al.* ; Xen. Cyr. ii. 2. 20, *al.* Paul *might* have written τίνες εἰσὶν οἱ κ.τ.λ., but he was not *under necessity* of doing so. — ἐξ ἐμοῦ] source of the λυπεῖσθαι. See Bernhardt, p. 227 ; Schoem. *ad Is.* p. 348 ; Winer, p. 345 [E. T. 460]. Comp. ἀφ’ ὧν, ver. 3 ; but ἐξ is “quiddam penitius,” Bengel.

Ver. 3 appends what Paul had done in consequence of the state of things mentioned in ver. 1 f. : *And I have written* (not reserved till I could communicate orally) *this very thing, i.e. exactly what I have written, in order not, when I shall have come, to have affliction*, etc. — ἔγραψα] placed first with emphasis, corresponds to the following ἐλθὼν, and does not at all refer to the *present* Epistle (Chrysostom and his followers, Grotius, and others, including Olshausen), against which opinion vv. 4, 9 are decisive, but to our *first* Epistle, the contents of which in reference to this point are rendered present by τοῦτο αὐτό ; as indeed οὗτος is used often of what is well known, which is pointed to as if it were lying before one (Kühner, II. p. 325). That Paul is thinking of the passages of *censure* and *rebuke* in the first Epistle (especially of chap. v.¹), results from the context, and suffices for its ex-

¹ Not merely iv. 21, wherein the μὴ ἐν λύπῃ ἐλθεῖν is held to be contained (Calovius, Osiander). iv. 21 was only a casual threat.

planation, so that the reference to a *lost* letter sent along with *Titus* (Bleek, Neander, Ewald, Klöpper ; see Introd. § 1) is not required. With Theodoret, Erasmus, Morus, Flatt, Rückert, Hofmann,¹ to take τοῦτο αὐτό as in 2 Pet. i. 5, *for this very reason*, cannot in itself be objected to (Bernhardy, p. 130 ; Kühner, § 549, A. 2 ; Ast, *ad Plat. Leg.* p. 214 ; and see on Gal. ii. 10 and on Phil. i. 6) ; but here, where Paul has just written in ver. 1 τοῦτο as the accusative of the object, and afterwards in ver. 9 expresses the sense *for this reason* by εἰς τοῦτο, there is no ground for it in the context. — ἵνα μὴ κ.τ.λ.] Since his arrival was at that time still impending, and Paul consequently denotes by ἵνα . . . ἔχω a purpose still continuing in the present, the subjunctive ἔχω (or σχῶ, as Lachmann, Rückert, and Tischendorf, read, following A B S*, Chrysostom, Theophylact, Oecumenius) after the preterite ἔγραψα is quite accurate (Matthiae, p. 1180) ; and Rückert is wrong when he takes ἐλθῶν hypothetically (*if I had come*), and refers σχῶ to the past. In that case, Paul *could not but* have used the optative. — ἀφ' ὧν] ἀπὸ τούτων, ἀφ' ὧν. See Bornem. *Schol. in Luc.* p. 2. — ἀπό, *on the part of*. Χαίρειν does not elsewhere occur with ἀπό, but εὐφραίνεσθαι is similarly joined with ἀπό, Xen. *Hier.* iv. 6 ; Judith xii. 20. — ἐδει] The imperfect indicates what properly (in the nature of the relation) *ought* to be, but what, in the case contemplated of the λύπην ἔχω, *is not*. See Matthiae, p. 1138 f. — πεποιθὼς κ.τ.λ.] subjective reason assigned for the specified purpose of the ἔγραψα : *since I cherish the confidence towards you all*, etc. Paul therefore says that, in order that he might find no affliction when present among them, he has communicated the matter by letter, because he is convinced that they would find their own joy in his joy (which, in the present instance, could not but be produced by the doing away of the existing evils according to the instructions of his letter). — ἐπί] of the direction of the confidence *towards* the readers. Comp. 2 Thess. iii. 4 ; Matt. xxvii. 43 ; Ps. cxxiv. 1. In classical authors usually with the dative, as i. 9. — πάντα ὑμᾶς] This, in spite of the anti-Pauline part of the church, is the language of the love which πάντα πιστεύει, πάντα ἐλπίζει, 1 Cor. xiii. 7. “Quodsi Pauli opinioni judicioque non respondeant Corinthii indigne cum frustrantur,” Calvin.

Ver. 4. Reason assigned for the πεποιθὼς κ.τ.λ. *For if I in writing the Epistle had not had that confidence, the Epistle would not have caused me so much grief and so many tears.* In the very contrast of this confidence with the necessity of having to write in such a manner lay the great pain. — ἐκ and διὰ vividly represent the origin of the letter as a going forth and a pressing through : *out of much affliction and anxiety of heart I wrote to you through many tears.* And this Paul might say, even if he had not himself held the pen. — θλίψις and σννοχή (*anxiety*, Luke xxi. 25 : not so among the Greeks, but see Schleusner, *Thes.* V. p. 212) do not refer to outward, but to *inward*

¹ Hofmann, in accordance with his interpretation of τοῦτο αὐτό, “*for this very reason*,” which serves to point to the following ἵνα μὴ κ.τ.λ., thus defines the relation of vv. 1 and 3 : This is what I resolved for myself, that I would not again come to you in sor-

row of heart. *And this is the very reason why I wrote to you : I did not wish to have sorrow of heart on my arrival*, etc. This is what Paul by the composition of his Epistle had wished to obtain for his sojourn, when he should come.

suffering, as both are defined by *καρδίας*. Rückert concludes from the calm tone of the first Epistle that Paul “had from prudent consideration known how to impose such restraint on his state of feeling, that the Epistle might not reflect any faithful picture of it.” But this would have been cunning dissimulation, not in keeping with the apostle’s character. No ; it was just his specially tender care for the Corinthians which on the one hand increased his pain that he needed to write such rebukes, and on the other hand did not allow his vehement emotion to emerge in that Epistle ; hence we must not say that the quiet character of our first Epistle is not psychologically in keeping with the utterance of this passage. In particular, 1 Cor. v. might have caused the apostle anxiety and tears enough, without our needing to suppose an intermediate letter (see on ver. 3). — *δακρύων*] Comp. Acts xx. 19, 31. Calvin aptly says : “mollitiem testantur, sed magis heroicam, quam fuerit illa ferrea Stoicorum durities.” — *οὐχ ἵνα λυπηθῇτε, ἀλλὰ κ.τ.λ.*] This added explanation regarding the *purpose* of his letter, to him so painful, is intended also to corroborate the *πεποithὼς κ.τ.λ.*, of which he has given assurance. — *τὴν ἀγάπην*] placed first for emphasis. — *περισσοτ.*] ἡ (εἰς) τοὺς ἄλλους μαθητάς, Theophylact, who, following Chrysostom, also directs attention to the winning tenderness of the words (*καταγλυκαίνει δὲ τὸν λόγον βουλόμενος ἐπισπασθαι αὐτούς*). Comp. i. 12. The love of the apostle for his churches has along with its universality its various degrees, just as the love of a father for his children. The Philippians also were specially dear to him.

Vv. 5–11. Digression regarding the pardon to be granted to the incestuous person.—That the *incestuous* person is meant, as even Klöpffer maintains in spite of his assumption of a lost intermediate letter, is denied by Tertullian (*de Pudicitia*, 13) simply for dogmatic-ascetic reasons. The exclusion, which Paul demanded in the first Epistle, v. 13, left open the possibility of a return to the communion of the church by the path of suitable penitence and expiation ; as may be gathered also from 1 Cor. v. 5, where the apostle’s threat of the higher excommunication, of the giving over to Satan, contemplates in this punishment the conversion and saving of the offender, and consequently shows clearly that in the apostle’s eyes the penal procedure of the church, even in the case of so grave a sin, was of a *paedagogic* nature in reference to the person of the evil-doer. The penance of the latter, however, as well as that of the whole church on his account (vii. 7. ff.), may have really been so deeply and keenly manifested, that Paul, in accordance with the now changed state of things, might express himself in such a mild, conciliatory way as he does here. And there is no sufficient ground in the passage for the assumption of an intermediate letter, or that there is here meant, not the unchaste person, but a slanderer rebuked by Paul in this intermediate letter (see Introd. § 1). Besides, the mild, soft tone of the present passage, if it referred to such a personal opponent, would not be in keeping with the quite different way in which, from chap. x. onwards, he pours forth his apostolic zeal against his personal opponents and slanderers.

Ver. 5. “To cause grief among you was not my intention (ver. 4) ; he,

however, who has (really) caused grief has not grieved me." In other words : "I did not wish to grieve you ; one of you, however, has with his afflicting influence, not affected me, but," etc. Olshausen connects ver. 5 with ver. 3 : "if, however, any one formerly has awakened grief." But how arbitrary it is to leap over the natural reference to the immediately preceding λυπηθῆτε ! And if the "formerly" made the contrast, it must have been somehow expressed.—In the hypothetical εἰ, as in the indefinite τις, there lies a delicate, tender forbearance. — οὐκ ἐμὲ λελύπηκεν, ἀλλ'] Paul does not say οὐ μόνον, ἀλλὰ καί, because as concerns the relation of the matter to himself he wishes absolutely to deny that he is the injured party. He *could* do this, because he did not belong to the church, and he wishes to leave wholly out of view his position as apostle and founder of the church in the interest of love and pardon. Olshausen thinks that he wishes indirectly to refute the erroneous position of some (impenitent) Corinthians towards the case of the incestuous person ; that many, namely, had lamented much to the apostle about the solicitude which that unhappy person had caused to him ; and that, in order to make these turn from him to themselves, he says that the question is not about him, but about them, that they should look to their own pain. But of this alleged direction to occupy themselves with their own pain, there is nothing whatever in what follows ; and the apostle would have set forth in more precise terms a rebuke so weighty ; it was not at all fitting here, where the touched heart beats only with mildness and forgiveness. — λελύπηκεν] Bengel says aptly : "contristatum habet." — ἀλλ' ἀπὸ μέρους κ.τ.λ.] *but in part, that I may not burden him* (with greater guilt), *you all*. ἀπὸ μέρους, which Paul adds φειδόμενος αὐτοῦ (Chrysostom), softens the thought in λελύπηκεν πάντας ὑμᾶς, while it expresses that the grief is only in a partial degree, not wholly and fully (as on the one immediately concerned) inflicted on *all*, i.e. on the whole church by means of moral sympathy ; only *quodammodo* (see Fritzsche *Diss.* I. p. 16 ff.), therefore, are the readers *all* affected by that grief as sharers in it. The ἵνα μὴ ἐπιβάρῳ (*sc.* αὐτόν) contains the purpose, for which he had added the softening limitation ἀπὸ μέρους. Beza, Calvin (in the Commentary), Calovius, Hammond, Homberg, Wolf, Estius, and others, following Chrysostom, agree with this punctuation and explanation ; also Emmerling, Fritzsche, Rückert, de Wette, Osiander, Neander, Ewald. Yet Rübiger explains it is if Paul had written σχεδόν instead of ἀπὸ μέρους. But others read ἵνα μὴ ἐπιβ. πάντας ὑμ. together : *he has not grieved me* (alone and truly), *but only in part* (consequently you also) ; *in order that I may not lay something to the charge of you all* ; for, if he had grieved me alone, you would all have been *indifferent* towards the crime. So Thomas, Lyra, Luther, Castalio, Zeger, Bengel, Wetstein, and others, including Flatt. Incorrectly, because οὐκ ἐμέ and ἀλλ' ἀπὸ μέρους cannot be antitheses. Mosheim and Billroth separate πάντας and ὑμᾶς : *he has not grieved me, but in part, that I may not accuse all, you* ; for I will not be unjust, and give you all the *blame* of having been indifferent towards that crime. At variance with the words ; for, according to these, with this punctuation they whom Paul accuses (ἐπιβαρεῖ) must appear to be not the indifferent, but those grieved by the incest. Olshausen also follows

this punctuation, but finds in ἀπὸ μέρους, ἵνα μὴ ἐπιβ. πάντας a delicate irony (comp. also Michaelis, who, however, follows our punctuation), in so far as Paul would have held it as the highest praise of the Corinthians, if he could have said : he has grieved you without exception. Since he could not have said this, he wittily turns his words in this way : he has not grieved me, but, as regards a part, you, in order that I may not burden you all with this care. But this very wit and irony are quite foreign to the mild tone and the conciliatory disposition of this part of the Epistle. Hofmann takes οὐκ ἐμὲ λελύπ. as a *question*, after which there comes in with ἀλλά the contrast (*nevertheless*) which continues over ver. 5 and includes ver. 6 ; in this case ἀπὸ μέρους is *temporal* in meaning (yet is “*first enough*”); and ἵνα μὴ ἐπιβαρῶ πάντας ὑμᾶς, which is to be taken together, is meant to say that the apostle, if he expressed himself dissatisfied with what had been done by the majority, would burden the whole church with the pain of knowing that one of their members was under the ban of sin which remained unforgiven on the part of the apostle ; lastly, the ὑπὸ τῶν πλειόνων stands in opposition to a minority, which had wished to *go beyond* the punishment decreed, a minority which is included in πάντας. But all this involved explanation is inadmissible, partly because the blunt question οὐκ ἐμὲ λελύπ., bringing forward so nakedly a sense of personal injury, would be sadly out of unison with the shrewdly conciliatory tone of the whole context ; partly because ἀπὸ μέρους, taken of *time*, is as linguistically incorrect as at i. 14, and would also furnish the indelicate thought of an *ικανότης with reservation*, and *till something further* ; partly because the complexity of thought, which is said to lie in ἐπιβαρῶ, is just imported into it ; partly because the supposition that the minority of the church would have gone still *further* in the punishment than the resolution of the majority went, is without any ground, nay, is in the highest degree improbable after the reproach of too great indulgence, 1 Cor. v.—On ἐπιβαρεῖν, comp. 1 Thess. ii. 9 ; 2 Thess. iii. 8 ; Dion. Hal. iv. 9, viii. 73 ; Appian, *B. C.* iv. 31. Comp. βάρος of the burden of a *feeling of guilt*, Gal. vi. 2. (R³)

Ver. 6. Ἰκανόν] *something sufficient* is, etc. Regarding this substantive use of the neuter of the predicate adjective, see Matthiae, p. 982 ; Kühner, II. p. 45. Comp. Matt. vi. 34. — τῷ τοιούτῳ] *for one of such a nature* ; how forbearing it is here that no more definite designation is given ! — ἡ ἐπιτιμία αὐτῇ] *this punishment*. What it was, every reader knew. Comp. on ver. 3. ἡ ἐπιτιμία (which in classic writers denotes the franchise of a citizen, Demosthenes, 230, 10, *al.*), in the signification *poena*, like the Greek τὸ ἐπιτίμιον (Dem. 915, 1 ; 939, 27, *al.*), ἡ ἐπιτίμησις (Wisdom. xii. 26), and τὸ ἐπιτίμημα (Inscript.), occurs only here in the N. T., but elsewhere also in Wisdom. iii. 10, in ecclesiastical writers, and in acts of councils (not in Philo). It is not merely *objurgatio* (Vulgate ; comp. Beza, Calvin, and others. (s³) — ἡ ὑπὸ τῶν πλειόνων] *which by the majority* (of the church) has been assigned to him. That the *presbyterium* is not meant (Augustine, Beza, Grotius, Valesius, and others), is shown by the article. There is a further question here, whether the excommunication enjoined by Paul, 1 Cor. v., was carried out or not (Beza, Calvin, Morus, Rückert, Hofmann). Most assume the former, so

that they refer *ικανόν* to the *sufficient duration* of the excommunication.¹ But an accomplished full excommunication is not to be assumed on account of the very *ὑπὸ τῶν πλειόνων* ; but it is probable that the majority of the church members, in consequence of the *ἐξάρατε τὸν πονηρόν* (1 Cor. v. 13 ; comp. ver. 2), had considered the sinner as one excommunicated, and had given up all fellowship with him. By this the majority had for the present sufficiently complied with the expressed will of the apostle. To the minority there may have belonged partly the most lax in morals, and partly also opponents of the apostle, the latter resisting him on principle.—Rückert, however, supported by Baur and Rübiger, regards Paul's judgment *ικανὸν κ.τ.λ.*, as a *prudent turn given* to the matter, by which, in order to avoid an open rupture, he represents what would have happened even without his will to be his own wish. But what justifies any one in attributing to him conduct so untruthful ? The real and great repentance of the sinner (ver. 7) induced the apostle to overlook the incompleteness in carrying out his orders for excommunication, and now from real sincere conviction to pronounce the *ικανόν* and desire his pardon. Comp. above on vv. 5–11. Had Paul not been really convinced that the repentance of the evil-doer had already begun (as even Lipsius, *Rechtfertigungsl.* p. 183, is inclined to suppose), he would here have pursued a *policy* of church-discipline quite at variance with his character. Calvin judges very rightly of this passage : “Locus diligenter observandus ; docet enim, qua aequitate et clementia temperanda sit disciplina ecclesiae, ne rigor modum excedat. Severitate opus est, ne impunitate (quae peccandi illecebra merito vocatur) mali redantur audaciores ; sed rursus, quia periculum est, ne is qui castigatur animum despondeat, hic adhibenda est moderatio, nempe ut ecclesia, simulatque resipiscentiam illius certo cognoverit, ad dandam veniam sit parata.”

Ver. 7. *So that you, on the contrary, rather (potius) pardon and comfort.* This is the consequence which ensued, connected with the utterance of *ικανὸν κ.τ.λ.* Hence the notion of *δεῖν* (Lobeck, *ad Phryn.* p. 754 ; Kühner, *ad Xen. Mem.* ii. 2. 1) is not here to be supplied, as Billroth and Olshausen wish, following the older commentators. It is not said what *ought to happen*, but what, according to the apostle's conception, ensued as a necessary and essential consequence of the *ικανὸν κ.τ.λ.* (Kühner, II. p. 564). The *χαρίσασθαι*, however, is not at variance with the reference to the adulterer (because forgiveness belongs to God—Bleek, Neander), for what is here spoken of in a general way is only *the* pardon, which the *church* imparts in reference to the offence produced in it, the pardon of *Christian* brethren (Eph. iv. 32 ; Col. iii. 20). — *τῇ περισσοτέρᾳ λύπῃ*] *through the higher degree of affliction*, which, namely, would be the consequence of the refusal of pardon, and certainly of the eventual complete excommunication. — *καταποθῇ*] Comp. 1 Cor. xv. 54 ; 1 Pet. v. 8. *This being swallowed up* is explained by some, of *dying* (Grotius, according to his view of an illness of the sinner), by others, of *suicide*, or of

¹ Most strange is the judgment of Grotius, that the apostle is here speaking not *de restituenda communione*, but *de auferendo morbo, quem ei Satanas ad preces piorum*

Corinthiorum immiserat. Paul had, in fact, not really ordained the giving over to Satan at all. See on 1 Cor. v. 5.

apostasy from Christianity (the latter is held by Theodoret, Pelagius, and others, also Flatt ; Kypke and Stolz, following Chrysostom, Theophylact, and others, leave a choice between the two); or as conveying a hint that the *λύπη* bordering on despair might drive him into the world, and he might be devoured by its prince (Olshausen). The latter point : “ by the prince of the world,” is quite arbitrarily imported. The *sadness* (conceived as a hostile animal) is what swallows up. The context gives nothing more precise than the notion : *to be brought* by the sadness to *despair*, to the abandoning of all hope and of all striving after the Christian salvation.¹ Comp. on *καταπίνειν* in the sense of destroying, Jacobs, *Animadv. in Athen.* p. 315.

Ver. 8. *Κυρῶσαι εἰς αὐτ. ἀγάπ.*] *to resolve in reference to him love*—*i.e.* through a resolution of the church to determine regarding him, that he be regarded and treated as an object of Christian brotherly love. On *κυροῦν*, of a resolution valid in law, comp. Herodotus, vi. 86, 126 ; Thuc. viii. 69 ; Polyb. i. 11. 3, i. 17. 1 ; Diod. Sic. ii. 9 ; Gal. iii. 15 ; Gen. xxiii. 20 ; 4 Macc. vii. 9. See Blomfield, *ad Aesch. Prom. Gloss.* 70, and *Pers.* 232. Here also (comp. on ver. 6) Rückert again finds a prudent measure of the apostle, whereby the form, if not also the thing (the apostolic approval), is saved. A diplomacy, which would be the opposite of i. 13.

Ver. 9. Vv. 9 and 10 are not to be placed in a parenthesis, nor ver. 9 alone (Flatt) ; but the discourse proceeds without interruption. Ver. 9, namely, begins to *furnish grounds* for the *κυρῶσαι εἰς αὐτὸν ἀγάπην*, and, first of all, *from the aim of the former Epistle*, which aim (in reference to the relation to the incestuous person in the case of most of them at least) was attained, so that now nothing on this point stood in the way of the *κυρῶσαι κ.τ.λ.* “ *Correcta enim eorum segnitie nihil jam obstabat, quominus hominem prostratum et jacentem sua mansuetudine erigerent,*” Calvin. — *εἰς τοῦτο*] points to the following *ἵνα κ.τ.λ.*, comp. ver. 1. It is : for *this* end in order that, etc. — *καὶ ἔγραψα* is not to be translated as if it stood : *καὶ γὰρ εἰς τοῦτο ἔγραψα* (Flatt), following the older commentators), but as, rightly, in the Vulgate : “ *ideo enim et scripsi.*” The *καί*, however, cannot be intended to mark the agreement with the present admonition (Hofmann), because Paul does not quote *what* he had written ; but it opposes the written to the oral communication (comp. vii. 12), and rests on the conception : I have not confined myself merely to oral directions (through your returning delegates), but—what should bind you all the more to observance—I have *also written*. This *ἔγραψα*, however, does not apply to the present Epistle (Chrysostom, Theodoret, Theophylact, Erasmus, Menochius, Wolf, Bengel, Heumann, Schulz, Morus, Olshausen, and others), but, as the whole context shows (comp. vv. 3, 4), to our *first* Epistle.² — *τὴν δοκιμὴν ὑμ.*] *your tried quality* (viii. 2, ix. 13, xiii. 3 ; Rom. v. 4 ; Phil. ii. 22),—*i.e.* *here*, according to the following epexegetis, *εἰ εἰς πάντα ὑπήκ. ἔστε* : *your assured submissiveness to me*. The aim thus stated of the first Epistle was, among its several aims (comp. vv. 3, 4), the very one, which presented itself here from the point

¹ The *ὁ τοιοῦτος* repeated at the end, in itself superfluous, has the tone of *compassion*.

² On the supposition of a lost intermediate Epistle, this *must* have been the one meant ; see Ewald. Comp. on ver. 3, vii. 12.

of view of the connection. — εἰς πάντα] *in reference to everything*, in every respect, therefore also in regard to my punitive measure against the incestuous man. Comp. phrases such as εἰς πάντα πρῶτον εἶναι (Plato, *Charm.* p. 158 A), and the like ; εἰς πάντα is here emphatic. (T³)

Ver. 10. A second motive for the κυρῶσαι εἰς αὐτὸν ἀγάπ. *And to whomsoever* (in order to hold before you yet another motive) *you give pardon as to anything, to him I also give pardon.* Δέ, accordingly, is the simple μεταβατικόν. Rückert wishes to supply a μέν before γάρ in ver. 9, so that ver. 9 and ver. 10 together may give the sense : “*It was, indeed, my wish to find perfect obedience among you ; but since you are willing to pardon him, I too am willing.*” But here, too, this supplement is altogether groundless ; nay, in this very case, where ver. 9 is referred by γάρ to what goes before, the express marking of the mutual relation of the two clauses would have been logically necessary, and hence μέν must have been used. Further, the *meaning* contained in Rückert’s explanation would express an indifference and accommodation so strangely at variance with the apostolic authority, that the apostle would only have been thereby lowered in the eyes of his readers. — ὃ δέ τι χαρίζεσθε, καὶ ἐγὼ] *general assurance* (and this general expression remains also in the reason assigned that follows), to which the present special case is subordinated. The reader *knew* to whom the ὅς and to what the τί were to be applied. — καὶ γὰρ ἐγὼ κ.τ.λ.] Reason assigned for what was just said. “*For this circumstance, that I also pardon him to whom you pardon anything, rests on reciprocity : what also I on my part have pardoned, if I have pardoned anything, I have pardoned with a regard to you*”—i.e. *in order that my forgiveness may be followed by yours.* This definite meaning of δι’ ὑμᾶς (not the general : *for your benefit*, as Flatt, de Wette, Oslander, and many others have it) is, according to the context, demanded by ὃ τι χαρ., καὶ ἐγὼ, in virtue of the logical relation of the clause containing the reason to this assurance. Paul, however, has not again written the *present* χαρίζομαι, but κεχάρισμαι, because he wishes to hold before his readers his own *example*, consequently his own precedent already set in the pardon in question. Between this κεχάρισμαι, however, and the χαρίζομαι to be supplied after καὶ ἐγὼ, there is no logical contradiction. For in ὃ δέ τι χαρίζεσθε the act of the sinner is considered as *an offence to the church* ; as such, the church *is to* forgive it, and then the apostle *will* also forgive it : but in καὶ γὰρ ἐγὼ ὁ κεχάρισμαι it is conceived as a *vexation to the apostle* ; as such, Paul *has* forgiven it, and that δι’ ὑμᾶς, *for the sake of the church*, in order that it too may now give free course to the pardon which the offence produced in it needed.¹ To this thoughtful combination of the various references of the act, and to the placable spirit by which the representation is pervaded, the intervening clause εἰ τι κεχάρισμαι corresponds, which is by no means intended to make the act of pardon *problematical* (de Wette), or to designate it only as *eventual*, turning on the supposition of the church granting forgiveness (Billroth), but contains a delicate ref-

¹ Not : to get rid of the painful relation in which they stood to that sinner, as Hof-

mann infers, from his incorrect interpretation of ἵνα μὴ ἐπιβαρῶ πάντας ὑμᾶς, ver. 5.

erence back to ver. 5, in this sense, namely : *if*—seeing that the sinner, according to ver. 5, has not in fact grieved me, but you—that which I designate as *κεχάρισμαι* is really this ; for the having pardoned presupposes the pardoner to be the *injured* party, which Paul, however, ver. 5, denied himself to be.—Against all versions, Fathers and expositors, Rückert has taken *κεχάρισμαι* *passively*¹ of the pardoning grace which Paul experienced through his *conversion*. The sense would thus be : “*for whatever I have got pardoned, if I have got anything pardoned, I have got it pardoned for your sakes* (in order as apostle of the Gentiles to lead you to salvation).” See my *third* edition. This exposition is incorrect, partly because there is nothing in the text to suggest an allusion to the apostle’s conversion ; partly because this pardoning grace was to him so firm and certain, and, in fact, the whole psychological basis of his working, that he could not, even in the most humble reminiscence of his pre-Christian conduct (comp. 1 Cor. xv. 9, 10), have presented it as problematical by *εἰ τι κεχάρισμαι* ; partly because with this problematical inserted clause the very *ἐν προσώπῳ Χριστοῦ* (explained by Rückert : “on the countenance of Christ beaming with God’s grace”) would be at variance. — *ἐν προσώπῳ Χριστοῦ*] *i.e. in conspectu Christi*, comp. Prov. viii. 30, Eccclus. xxxii. 4, denotes the having pardoned, in so far as it has taken place *δι’ ὑμᾶς*, in its fullest *purity and truth*. It has taken place *in presence of Christ*, so that He was *witness* of it. (U³) Interpretations at variance with the words are : *in Christ’s stead* (Vulgate, Ambrosiaster, Luther, Calovius, Wetstein, and others) : *by Christ*, as an oath (Emmerling), and others. Hofmann, who without reason maintains that according to our view it must have run *ὡς ἐν προσώπῳ Χ.*, attaches the words to what follows, so that they would precede the *ἵνα* by way of emphasis, like τ. ἀγάπην, ver. 4 (see on Rom. xi. 31), and the meaning would be : *Christ should not be obliged to be a spectator* of how Satan deprives His church of one of its members. This interpretation could only be justified if we were in any way by the context prepared for the *ἐν προσώπῳ Χ.*, thus taken as a *pecially tragic feature* of the devil’s guile. Besides, the thought that the devil injures the church *under the eyes of Christ*, would be nowhere else expressed. — Observe, further, how, according to this passage, the penitence of the sinner, just as much as the removal of the offence to the church, is the aim of church-discipline, and hence its initiation and cessation are to be measured accordingly ; but the Roman Catholic doctrine of indulgence² is at variance with this.

Ver. 11. Aim of this pardon imparted *δι’ ὑμᾶς* : *that we might not be overreached*, etc. A being *overreached* by Satan, the enemy of Christ and of Christianity, would be the result if that pardon were refused to the sinner, and thereby his *καταποθῆναι τῇ περισσοτέρᾳ λύπῃ* were brought about ; for thereby Satan would get a member of the church into his power, and thus derive *advantage to our loss*. On the *passive* *πλεονεκτεῖσθαι*, comp. Dem. 1035,

¹ This passive use would in itself be correct as to language. See Kühner, *ad Xen. Mem.* i. 2. 10. The transitive use, however, is the more usual one, as at Gal. iii.

18; Acts xxvii. 24.

² Still Bisping finds its principles clearly traced out in this passage.

26. The *subject* is Paul and the Corinthian church. — οὐ γὰρ αὐτοῦ κ.τ.λ.] “By Satan, I say, for *his* thoughts (what he puts forward as product of his νοῦς ; comp. on iii. 14, iv. 4, x. 5, xi. 3) are not unknown to us.” νοήματα ἀγνοοῦμεν forms a paronomasia. These thoughts : 1 Pet. v. 8 ; Eph. vi. 11. The discerning of them in the individual case is spiritual prudence, which we have in the possession of the νοῦς of Christ (1 Cor. ii. 16). (v³)

Vv. 12, 13. Since Paul, by mentioning the mood in which he had written his former Epistle (ver. 4), was led on to discuss the case of the conscious sinner and the pardon to be bestowed on him (vv. 5–11), he has now only to carry on the *historical* thread which he had begun in vv. 4 and 5.¹ There he had said with what great grief he wrote our first Epistle. Now, he tells how, even after his departure from Ephesus, this disquieting anxiety about his readers did not leave him, but urged him on from Troas to Macedonia without halting. This he introduces by δέ, which after the end of the section, vv. 5–11, joins on again to ver. 4 (Hartung, *Partik.* I. p. 173 ; Fritzsche, *Diss.* II. p. 21). Billroth attempts to connect it with what immediately precedes : “His designs are not unknown to us ; all the more I had no rest.” Against this may be urged, not that ἀλλά must have stood instead of δέ, as Rückert thinks (see Hartung, *l.c.* I. p. 171 f. ; Baeumlein, *Partik.* p. 95) ; but rather that between the emphatically prefixed οὐ γὰρ αὐτοῦ, ver. 11, and ἐλθὼν δέ, no logical relation of contrast exists. — εἰς τὴν Τρωάδα] from Ephesus on the journey which was to take him through Macedonia to Corinth. 1 Cor. xvi. 5–9. — εἰς τὸ εὐαγγ. τοῦ Χ.] Aim of the ἐλθ. εἰς τ. Τρωάδα : *for the sake of the gospel of Christ*—i.e. in order to *proclaim* this message of salvation (hence τοῦ Χ. is *genitivus objecti*, see generally on Mark i. 1). He might, indeed, have come to Troas *without* wishing to preach, perhaps only as a traveller passing through it. All the more groundless is the involved connection of the εἰς τ. εὐαγγ. with the far remote ἀνεσιν (Hofmann). — καὶ θύρας κ.τ.λ.] *when also* (i.e. *although*, see Bornem. *ad Xen. Symp.* iv. 13 ; Kühner, *ad Mem.* ii. 3. 19) *a favourable opportunity for apostolic work was given to me*. Comp. on 1 Cor. xvi. 9. — ἐν κυρίῳ] That is the *sphere in which* a door was opened to him : *in Christ*, in so far as the work opened up to him was not out of Christ (one outside of Christianity), but Christ was the element of it : ἐν κυρ. gives the *specific quality* of *Christian* to what is said by θύρ. μ. ἀν. — ἔσχηκα] The perfect vividly *realizes* the past event, as often in the Greek orators. Comp. i. 9, vii. 5 ; Rom. v. 2. See Bernhardt, p. 379. — τῷ πνεύματί μου] *Dativus commodi*. Paul has not put τῇ ψυχῇ μου, because here (it is different at vii. 5) he wishes to express that his very higher life-activity, which has its psychological ground and centre in the πνεῦμα as the organ of the moral self-consciousness (comp. on Luke i. 46 f.), was occupied by anxious care as to the state of the Corinthians, so that he felt himself thereby, for the present, incapable of pursuing other official interests, or of turning his thoughts away from Corinthian concerns. Comp. vii. 13 ; 1 Cor. xvi. 18. — τῷ μὴ εὑρεῖν] *on account of not finding*, because I did not find.

¹ Laurent regards vv. 12 and 13 as a marginal remark made by the apostle at i. 16, and wrongly inserted here.

Comp. Xenophon, *Cyr.* iv. 5. 9 ; often in Greek. See Winer, p. 308 [E. T. 344]. — *τίτον*] whom he had sent to Corinth, and whose return he impatiently expected, in order to receive from him news of the effect of the former Epistle. — *τὸν ἀδελφ. μου*] By *μου* the closer relation of *fellowship in office* is suggested for *ἀδελφ.* — *αὐτοῖς*] the Christians in Troas. As to *ἀποταξ.* see on Mark vi. 46. — *ἐξῆλθον*] from Troas. — *εἰς Μακεδ.*] Titus was therefore instructed by Paul to travel from Corinth back to Troas through Macedonia, and to meet with him again either there or here.

Ver. 14. In Macedonia, however, he had met Titus, and, through him, received good news of the impression made by his former Epistle. See vii. 6. Therefore he continues : *But thanks be to God*, etc., placing first not *χάρις*, as in most cases (viii. 16, ix. 15), but *τῷ Θεῷ*, because, *in very contrast to his own weakness*, the helping *God*, whom he has to thank, comes into his mind. Comp. 1 Cor. xv. 57. Others here make a digression go on as far as vii. 5, and refer the thanks to the spread of the gospel in Troas (Emmerling !) or Macedonia (Flatt, Osiander). Comp. Calvin and Bengel. Against the context ; for, after the description of the anxiety and disquiet, the utterance of thanks must relate to the release from this state (comp. Rom. vii. 24 f.). The apostle, however, in the fulness of his gratitude to God, includes (and thereby makes known) his *special* experience of the guidance of divine grace at that time in the *general* thanksgiving for the latter, as he experiences it *always* in his calling. This also in opposition to Hofmann, who abides by the general nature of the thanksgiving, and that in contrast to the declaration that the apostle did not preach in Troas in spite of the good opportunity found there. — *τῷ πάντοτε θριαμβέοντι ἡμᾶς*] given rightly by the Vulgate : “*qui semper triumphat nos*,” is taken by many older expositors (Luther, Beza, Estius, Grotius, and others) and by some more recent (Emmerling, Flatt, Rückert, Olshausen, Osiander) : *who makes us always triumph*.¹ It is certainly a current Greek custom to give to neuter verbs a *factitive* construction and meaning. See in general, Matthaie, p. 1104, 944 ; Fritzsche, *ad Matth.* p. 250 ; Bähr, *ad Ctes.* p. 132 ; Lobeck, *ad Aj.* 40, 869. Comp. from the N. T., *ἀνατέλλειν τὸν ἥλιον*, Matt. v. 45 ; *καίειν τι*, Matt. v. 15 ; *μαθητεύειν τινά*, Matt. xxviii. 19 ; from the LXX., *βασιλεύειν τίνα*, 1 Sam. viii. 22 ; Isa. vii. 6, *al.* Comp. 1 Macc. viii. 13. *θριαμβεύειν τινά* is thus taken : *to make any one a triumpher*. Comp. *ορεύειν τινά* *to make any one dance*—i.e. *to celebrate by means of dancing* (Brunck, *ad Soph. Ant.* 1151 ; comp. Jacobs, *ad Del. epigr.* x. 55, 90). The suitableness of the sense cannot be denied, but the actual usage is against it ; for *θριαμβεύειν τινά* has never that assumed factitive sense, but always means *triumphare de aliquo*, to conduct, to present any one in triumph ; so that the accusative is never the triumphing subject, but always the object of the triumph, as Plut. *Thes. et Rom.* 4 : *βασιλεῖς ἐθριάμβευσε καὶ ἡγεμόνας*, also Plut. *Mor.* p. 318 B, *θριαμβ. νίκην*. Quite similar is the Latin *triumphare aliquem*. See in general, Wetstein ; Kypke, II. p. 243. Comp. also Hofmann on the passage. Paul himself follows this usage,

¹ To this also the expositions of Chrysostom and Theophylact ultimately amount. The latter says : *ἡμᾶς οὖν ὁ Θεὸς μετὰ τῶν*

κατὰ τοῦ διαβόλου τροπαίων περιφανεῖς ποιεῖ. So in substance Chrys. Comp. Ambrosiaster, Anselm, and others.

see Col. ii. 15. We are thus the less authorized to depart from it. Hence it is to be translated: *who always triumphs over us* (apostolic teachers)—*i.e. who does not cease to represent us as his vanquished before all the world*, as a triumpher celebrates his victories. In this figurative aspect Paul considers himself and his like as *conquered* by God through their conversion to Christ. And after this *victory* of God his *triumph* now consists in all that those conquered by their conversion effect as servants and instruments of God for the Messianic kingdom in the world; it is by the results of apostolic activity that God continually, as if in triumph, shows himself to the eyes of all as the victor, to whom His conquered are subject and serviceable. For the concrete instance before us, this perpetual triumph of God exhibited itself in the happy result which He wrought in Corinth through the apostle's letter (as Paul learned in Macedonia through Titus, vii. 6). Note further, how naturally with Paul this very conception of his working, as a continual triumph of God over him, might proceed from the painful remembrance of his earlier persecution of the church of God, and how at the same time this whole conception is an expression of the same humility, in which he, 1 Cor. xv. 10, gives to God alone the glory of his working. Jerome, *ad Hedib.* 11, translates rightly: *triumphat nos* or *de nobis*, but quite alters the sense of the word again by the interpretation: "*triumphum suum agit per nos.*" Theodoret does not do justice to the notion of the *triumph*, when he merely explains it: *ὁς σοφῶς τὰ καθ' ἡμᾶς πρυτανεύων τῇδε κάκεῖσε περιάγει δῆλους ἡμᾶς ἀπασιν ἀποφαίνων.* Wetstein is more exact, but also takes the element of leading about, and not that of celebrating the victory, as the point of comparison: "*Deus nos tanquam in triumpho circumducit, ut non maneamus in loco, aut in alium proficiscamur pro lubito nostro, sed ut placet sapientissimo moderatori. Quem Damasci vicit, non Romae et semel, sed per totum terrarum orbem, quamdiu vivit, in triumpho ducit.*" Comp. Krause, *Opusc.* p. 125 f. The conception of antiquity, according to which the *θριαμβεύμενος* is necessarily the conquered, is quite abandoned by Calvin,¹ Elsner, Bengel: "*qui triumpho nos ostendit, non ut victos, sed ut victoriae suae ministros.*" So also de Wette, and substantially Ewald: comp. Erasmus, *Annot.* (x³) — *ἐν Χριστῷ*] Christ is the element in which that constant triumph of God takes place: no fact in which that consists has its sphere out of Christ: each is of specifically Christian quality.—The following *καὶ τ. ὁσμὴν κ.τ.λ.* declares *what God effects through His triumphing*. That *αὐτοῦ* refers not to *God* (so usually, as also Hofmann, following the Vulgate), but to *Christ* (Bengel, Osiander), is shown by ver. 15. The genitive *τῆς γνώσε. αὐτ.* is the genitive of *apposition* (comp. i. 22), so that the knowledge of Christ is symbolized as an odour which God everywhere makes manifest through the apostolic working, inasmuch as He by that means brings it to pass that the knowledge of Christ everywhere exhibits and communicates its nature and its efficacy. How does Paul come upon this image? Through

¹ In the translation he has *triumphare nos facit*: and in the Commentary it is said: "Paulus autem intelligit, se quoque triumphum, quem Deus agebat, fuisse participem,

quod esset opera sua acquisitus; qualiter legati currum primarii ducis equis insidentes comitabantur tanquam honoris socii."

the conception of the *triumph*; for such an event took place amid *perfumes of incense*: hence to assume *no* connection between the two images (Osiander) is arbitrary. To think of *ointments* (Oecumenius, Grotius), or of these as included (Chrysostom, Theophylact, Beza¹), is alien to the first image; and is as alien to suppose that a *closed vessel*, filled with perfume, is meant, and that the *φανεροῦντι* points to the *opening* of the same (Hofmann). Observe, moreover, that by *δι' ἡμῶν* (since the *ἡμεῖς* are *those conducted in the triumph, οἱ θριαμβευόμενοι*) the *thing itself* finds its way into the image, and by this the latter loses in congruity.

Ver. 15 f. Further confirmatory development of the previous *καὶ τ. ὁσμὴν κ.τ.λ.*, in which, however, Paul does not keep to the continuity of the figure, but, with his versatility of view, now represents the apostolic teachers *themselves* as odour. — *Χριστοῦ ἐὼδία*] may mean a perfume *produced by Christ*, or *one filled with Christ, breathing of Christ*. The latter, (Calvin, Estius, Bengel, Rückert, Osiander, and most expositors; comp. also Hofmann) corresponds better with the previous *ὁσμὴ τῆς γνώσεως αὐτοῦ*, and is more in keeping with the emphasis which the prefixed *Χριστοῦ* has, because otherwise the *ἐὼδία* would remain quite undefined as regards its essential quality. The *sense* of the figurative expression is: *for our working stands in the specific relation to God, as a perfume breathing of Christ*. The image itself is considered by most (comp. Ritschl in the *Jahrb. für. d. Th.* 1863, p. 258) as borrowed from the *sacrificial fragrance* (so also Billroth, Rückert, Olshausen, de Wette, Osiander, Ewald), on which account appeal is made to the well-known *ὁσμὴ ἐὼδίας* of the LXX., *וְהָיָה רִיחַ*, Lev. i. 9, 13, 17, *al.* But as Paul, wherever else he uses the image of sacrifice, marks it distinctly, as Eph. v. 2, Phil. iv. 18, and in the present passage the statedly used *ὁσμὴ ἐὼδίας* does not stand at all, it is more probable that he was not thinking of an odour of sacrifice (which several, like Billroth, Ewald, Ritschl, find already in *ὁσμὴ*, ver. 14), but of *the odours of incense that accompanied the triumphal procession*; these are to God a fragrance, redolent to Him of Christ. That in this is symbolized the relation of the *acceptableness to God* of the apostolic working, is seen from the very word chosen, *ἐὼδία*, which Hofmann misconstrues by explaining *τῷ θεῷ* to God's service. — *καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἀπολλ.*] *and among those, who incur eternal death*; comp. iv. 3. See on 1 Cor. i. 18. Grotius strangely wishes to supply here *κακῶδία ex vi contrariorum*. It is, in fact, the relation *to God* that is spoken of, according to which the working of the Apostle is to Him *ἐὼδία*, whether the odour be exhaled among *σωζόμενοι* or *ἀπολλυμένοι*. Comp. Chrysostom. To take *ἐν* in the sense of *operative on* (Osiander) anticipates what follows. Comp. iv. 3. — Ver. 16 specifies now the different relation of this odour to the two classes. Paul, however, does not again use *ἐὼδία*, but the in itself indifferent *ὁσμὴ*, because the former would be unsuitable for the first half, while the latter suits both halves. — *ἐκ θανάτου εἰς θάνατον*] an odour, *which arises from death and produces death*. The source, namely, of the odour is Christ,

¹ Beza, Grotius, and also L. Cappellus, contrary to the context, find an allusion to the anointing of the *priests*.

and He, according to the idea of the *λίθος τοῦ προσκόμματος* (Rom. ix. 33 ; 1 Pet. ii. 8 ; Acts iv. 11), is for those who refuse the faith the author of eternal death.¹ For them, therefore, in accordance with their inward attitude towards Him, Christ, the source of the odour, *i.e.* of the apostolic activity, is *death*, and also the effect is death, though Christ *in Himself* is and works eternal life. Comp. Matt. xxi. 44 ; Luke ii. 34. Hence Christ, by means of the *κρίσις* which He brings with Him, is the source respectively of death and life, according as His preaching is accepted by one to salvation, is rejected by another to destruction. In the latter case the blame of Christ's being *θάνατος*, although he is, as respects His nature and destination, *ζωή*, lies on the side of man in his resistance and stubbornness. Comp. 1 Cor. i. 23, also John ix. 39, iii. 18 f., xii. 48. "Semper ergo distinguendum est proprium evangelii officium ab accidentali (ut ita loquar), quod hominum pravitati imputandum est, qua fit, ut vita illis vertatur in mortem," Calvin. Comp. Düsterdieck on 1 John, I. p. 166. This, at the same time, in opposition to Rückert, who objects that the apostolic activity and preaching can in no way be regarded as proceeding from *θάνατος*, and who therefore prefers the *Recepta*,² in which Reiche and Neander agree. Gregory of Nyssa remarks aptly in Oecumenius : κατὰ τὴν προσοῦσαν ἐκάστῳ διάθεσιν ἡ ζωοποιὸς ἐγένετο, ἡ θανατηφόρος ἢ εὐπνοία. Quite similar forms of expression are found in the Rabbins, who often speak of an *aroma* (אָרומא, see Buxt. *Lex. Talm.* p. 1494 ; L. Cappellus on the passage), or *odor vitae* and *mortis*, see in Wetstein and Schoettgen. (z³) — καὶ πρὸς ταῦτα τίς ἱκανός ;] This no longer depends on the *ὅτι* of ver. 15 (Hofmann), a connection to which the interrogatory form would be so thoroughly unsuitable that no reader could have lighted on it ; but after Paul has expressed the great, decisive efficacy of his calling, there comes into his mind the crowd of disingenuous teachers as a contrast to that exalted destination of the office, and with the quickly interjected *καί* he hence asks with emotion : *And who is for this* (*i.e.* for the work symbolized in vv. 15 and 16) *fit* ? Who is qualified for this ? The *τίς* is intentionally pushed towards the end of the question, in order to arrest reflection at the important *πρὸς ταῦτα*, and then to bring in the question itself by surprise. Comp. Herod. v. 33 : σοὶ δὲ καὶ τούτοις τοῖσι πράγμασι τί ἐστι ; Plat. *Conv.* p. 204 D : ὁ ἐρῶν τῶν καλῶν τί ἐρᾷ ; Xen. *Cyr.* iv. 6, 8 ; Rom. viii. 24 ; Eph. iv. 9 ; Acts xi. 17. (A⁴)

Ver. 17. The answer to the foregoing question is not to be *supplied*, so that it should be conceived as negative (*εἰ δὲ μὴ ἱκανοὶ, χάριτος τὸ γινόμενον*, Chrysostom, Neander, Hofmann, and others), but it is *given*, though indi-

¹ *Θάνατος* and *ζωή* are to be understood both times of eternal life and death. The contrast of *σωζόμενοι* and *ἀπολλυμένοι* permits no other interpretation: comp. vii. 10. Ewald takes *ἐκ θανάτου* of temporal death and *ἐκ ζωῆς* of temporal life: from the former we fall into eternal death, and from the temporal life we come into the eternal.

² According to the *Recepta*, which Hofmann also follows, *ὁσμὴ ζωῆς* is *life-giving*

odour, and *ὁσμὴ θανάτου* is *deadly odour* ; *εἰς θάνατον* and *εἰς ζ.* would then be solemn additions of the final *result*, which actually ensues from the life-giving deadly *power* of the odour. According to Hofmann, the genitives are intended to mean: in which they *get to smell* of death and of life respectively. But comp. expressions like *ἄρτος τ. ζωῆς*, *φῶς τ. ζωῆς*, *λόγος ζωῆς* *ῥήματα ζωῆς*.

rectly, in ver. 17 itself, inasmuch as the expression introduced by γάρ readily suggests to the reader the conclusion, that the subjects of ἐσμεν, i.e. Paul and his like, are the ἱκανοί, and that the πολλοί are not so. See Klotz, *ad Devar.* p. 240 ; Bauemlein, *Partik.* p. 83. If Paul had wished to convey in his question the negative statement, “No one is capable of this,” he could not but have added a limiting ἀφ’ ἐαυτοῦ or the like (comp. iii. 5), in order to place the reader in the right point of view. — οἱ πολλοί] *the known many*, the anti-Pauline teachers.¹ Comp. xi. 13 ; Phil. iii. 18. See on οἱ πολλοί “*de certis quibusdam et definitis multis*,” Ellendt, *Lex. Soph.* II. p. 603 ; comp. also Rom. xii. 5. To understand by it *the majority of the Christian teachers* in general, is to throw a shadow on the apostolic church, which its history as known to us at least does not justify. — καπηλεύοντες] belongs to ἐσμέν. The verb means (1) to carry on the business of a κάπηλος, a retailer, particularly a vintner ; (2) to negotiate ; (3) to practise usury with anything (τι), in particular, by adulteration, since the κάπηλοι adulterated the wine (LXX. Isa. i. 25), and in general, had an evil reputation for cheating (κάπηλα τεχνήματα, Aesch. *Fragm.* 328 D). In this sense the word is also used by the Greeks of *intellectual objects*, as Plato, *Protag.* p. 313 D : οἱ τὰ μαθήματα . . . καπηλεύοντες. Comp. Lucian, *Hermot.* 59 : φιλόσοφοι ἀποδίδονται τὰ μαθήματα ὥσπερ οἱ κάπηλοι, κερασάμενοί γε οἱ πολλοὶ καὶ δολώσαντες καὶ κακομετροῦντες. Philostr. 16 : τὴν σοφίαν καπηλεύειν. So also here : comp. the opposite ἐξ εἰλικρ. and iv. 2. Hence : *we practise no deceitful usury* with the word of God, as those do, who, with selfish intention, dress up what they preach as the word of God palatably and as people wish to hear it, and for that end τὰ αὐτῶν ἀναμυγρύνουσι τοῖς θεοῖς, Chrysostom. Comp. 2 Pet. ii. 3. Such are named in Ignat. *Trall.* (interpol.) 6, comp. 10, χριστέμποροι ; and are described as τὸν ἰδὸν προσπλέκοντες τῆς πλάνης τῇ γλυκεῖᾳ προσηγορίᾳ. — ἀλλ’ ὥς ἐξ εἰλικρ.] *but we speak* (λαλοῦμεν) *as one speaks from sincerity of mind* (which has no dealings with adulteration), so that what we speak proceeds from an honest heart and thought. Comp. i. 12. ὥς is as in John i. 14. On ἐκ, compare John iii. 31, viii. 44 ; 1 John iv. 5. — ἀλλ’ ὥς ἐκ θεοῦ] *but as one speaks from God* (who is *in* the speaker), as θεόπνευστος. Comp. Matt. x. 20 ; 1 Cor. xiv. 25 ; 2 Cor. v. 20. The ἀλλά is repeated in the lively climax of the thought. Comp. vii. 11, and see on 1 Cor. vi. 11. Rückert strangely wishes to connect it with τὸν λόγον, and to supply ὄντα. So also Estius (“*tanquam profectum et acceptum a Deo*”), Emmerling, and others. That is, in fact, impossible after ἀλλ’ ὥς ἐξ εἰλικρ. — κατέναντι θεοῦ ἐν Χριστῷ] Since neither ἀλλά nor ὥς is repeated before κατέναντι, Paul himself indicates the connection and division : “*but as from sincerity, but as from God, we speak before God in Christ*,” so that the commas after the twice occurring θεοῦ are, with Lachmann and Tischendorf, to be deleted. This in opposition to the opinion cherished also by Hofmann, that κατέναντι θεοῦ and ἐν Χριστῷ are two modal definitions of λαλοῦμεν, running parallel with the foregoing points. — κατέναντι θεοῦ] *before*

¹ Not merely the anti-Pauline *Gentile teachers*, as Hofmann with the reading οἱ λοιποί arbitrarily limits it. It was among the Jewish-Christians that the most of those

were found whom Paul had to regard as falsifiers of the word, and who everywhere pushed themselves into the sphere of his labours.

God, with the consciousness of having Him present as witness. Comp. Rom. iv. 17. — ἐν Χριστῷ] can neither mean *Christi nomine* (Grotius, comp. Luther, Estius, Calovius, Zachariae, Heumann, Schulz, Rosenmüller), nor *de Christo* (Beza, Cornelius à Lapide, Morus, Flatt), nor *secundum Christum* (Calvin), but it is the habitually employed expression *in Christo*. We speak *in Christo*, in so far as Christ is the sphere in which our speaking moves. Comp. xii. 19 ; Rom. ix. 1. In Him we live and move with our speaking, οὐδὲν τῇ ἡμετέρᾳ σοφίᾳ ἀλλὰ τῇ παρ' ἐκείνου δυνάμει ἐνηχοῦμενοι, Chrysostom.

NOTES BY AMERICAN EDITOR.

(Q³) *Paul's motive.* Ver. 1.

This view of the dative, which is surely correct, is adopted by the Revision of 1881, which renders the clause thus : "I determined this for myself."

(R³) *Paul's forbearance.* Ver. 5.

The sense of the verse seems to be : "The wrong in the case has been done not to me personally, but to some extent (for I would not press you too hard) to you all." The real injury was inflicted not upon the Apostle, but upon the whole church as those who tolerated the crime. Stanley says, with justice, that it is evident that the horror excited by the First Epistle against the offender had been very great.

(S³) *Punishment.* Ver. 6.

The meaning of the original word is certainly punishment (Wisdom iii. 10), and its employment by the Apostle sheds light upon the nature and aims of church discipline. What this punishment actually was, does not appear. But it was followed by genuine and overwhelming sorrow on the part of the offender, and in view of this fact Paul says that it was sufficient. The whole passage indicates that Paul was more lenient than the church, for he exhorts them not to be too severe in the treatment of their offending brother.

(T³) "*Obedient in all things.*" Ver. 9.

Obedience to legitimate authority is one of the fruits and evidences of Christian sincerity. A rebellious, self-willed, disobedient spirit is a strong indication of an unsanctified nature (Hodge).

(U³) "*In the person of Christ.*" Ver. 10.

As if Christ Himself were present and looking on. Nothing could be better adapted to secure both fidelity and tenderness in administering the discipline of Christ's house, than the feeling that the eyes of Christ were fixed upon the judges.

(V³) *Satan's devices.* Ver. 11.

These are, in a matter of this kind, first to corrupt the church by inducing it to tolerate open sin, and then, when discipline is interposed, to render it so

harsh and severe and protracted that the offender is either hardened in sin or driven to despair.

(x³) *Who leadeth us in triumph.* Ver. 14.

Meyer's view of this clause, though stoutly resisted by Principal Brown (Pop. Com.), is adopted by Stanley, Alford, Conybeare, Waite, Beet, and Plumptre, and is given in the Revised Version. The *neuter* sense of the verb, "to triumph over" us, easily passes into the *transitive*, to lead us in triumph. The *causative* sense has, as Meyer says, all New Testament and Hellenistic usage against it. The Speaker's Commentary adopts Calvin's view, and gives the sense thus: "Thanks be unto God, who at all times makes a triumphal pageant of us, as His victorious officers or soldiers."

(y³) "*In them that are saved.*" Ver. 15.

See on I. i. 18. Hodge justly says there is no reference to foreordination, as if the words meant those destined either to be saved or lost. "But the two classes are designated *ex eventu*. The gospel and those who preach it are well pleasing to God, whether men receive it and are saved, or reject it and are lost. The light is inestimably precious, whether the eye rejoices in it or through disease is destroyed by it."

(z³) "*From death unto death.*" Ver. 16.

Either a Hebrew superlative, or a combination expressing the quality of the source, a deadly savour, and the nature of the effect, a savour producing death. So of the corresponding phrase, "a savour from life unto life."

(A⁴) *Who is sufficient for these things?* Ver. 16.

The explanation of Meyer is that of nearly all critics. The Apostle meant that he was sufficient (not of course of himself, for this is plainly denied in the 5th verse of the next chapter: "our sufficiency is from God"), and the ground of the sufficiency is stated in the next verse. There is, as Calvin says, an implied antithesis. The object of preaching is the diffusion of the knowledge of Christ: the effect of that diffusion is life to some and death to others. Who, then, is competent to this work? Not your false teachers, who corrupt the word of God, but I and others who preach the gospel from pure motives.—The words of all faithful ministers are spoken in the presence of God and in union with Christ as their encompassing element.

CHAPTER III.

Ver. 1. ἢ μὴ] So also Griesb. Lachm. Scholz, Rück. Tisch., following B C D E F G $\aleph$, min. Vulg. It. Syr. Arr. Copt. Slav. Theodoret, and Latin Fathers. But εἰ μὴ (Elz. Reiche) has also considerable attestation (A K L, min. Chrys. Damasc. *al.*), and since after the interrogation the ἢ continuing it occurred to the copyists more readily than the conditional εἰ, the latter, whose explanation is also more difficult, is to be preferred.¹—The second *συνστατικῶν* (after *ἰμῶν*) is wanting in A B C $\aleph$, min. Copt. Arm. Vulg. Chrys. Theodoret, and several Fathers. Deleted by Lachm. and Rück. An addition by way of gloss, which in F G is further increased by *ἐπιστολῶν*. — Ver. 3. *καρδίας*] So Iren. Orig. Vulg. But A B C D E G L $\aleph$ and many min. have *καρδιας*. So Lachm. An error of the copyist after ver. 2. — Ver. 5. ἀφ' ἐαυτῶν] has its correct position after *λογίσι*. *τι*, as is abundantly attested by A D E F G, It. Vulg. Goth. and Latin Fathers (so also Lachm. Tisch. and Rück.). The *Recepta* after *ἱκανοὶ ἐσμεν*, and the position before *ἱκανοὶ* in B C $\aleph$, min. Copt. Arm. Bas. Antioch. are to be regarded as superfluous transpositions to connect the ἀφ' ἐαυτῶν with *ἱκανοὶ ἐσμεν*. — Ver. 7. ἐν γράμμασιν] Lachm.: ἐν γράμματι, following B D* F G. A mechanical repetition of the singular from ver. 6. — Before *λίθοις*, Elz. Scholz have ἐν. An explanatory addition against decisive evidence. — Ver. 9. ἡ διακονία] A C D* F G $\aleph$, min. Syr. utr. Clar. Germ. Or. Cyr. Ruf.: τῇ διακονίᾳ. So Lachm. and Rück. An interpretation instead of which Sedul. and Ambrosiast. have *ex* or *in ministerio*, while others applied the interpreting at *δόξα*, as still Vulg. Sixtin. Pel. read ἐν δόξῃ. — ἐν δόξῃ] ἐν is wanting in A B C $\aleph^*$ (*δόξα*), 17, 39, 80, Tol. Vulg. ms. Deleted by Lachm., bracketed by Rück. The ἐν slipped in easily from ver. 8; comp. ver. 11. — Ver. 10. οὐ] Elz.: οὐδέ, against decisive evidence. Originated by the first syllable of the *δεδοξ.* that follows. — Ver. 13. Instead of ἐαυτοῦ, αὐτοῦ is, according to decisive testimony, to be read with Lachm. and Tisch. — Ver. 14. ἡμέρας] is wanting in Elz., but has decisive attestation, and was passed over as superfluous (comp. ver. 15). — Ver. 15. ἀναγινώσκεται] Lachm. and Rück.: ἂν ἀναγινώσκηται, in accordance with A B C $\aleph$, while D E have the subjunctive, but not ἂν. Since the ἂν before ἀναγ. might be introduced through a mistake of the copyist just as easily as it might be left out, we have merely to decide according to the preponderance of the evidence, which proves to be all the more in favour of Lachmann's reading, because this is supported also by D E with their retention of the subjunctive (without ἂν), while they betray the copyist's omission of the ἂν. — Ver. 17. ἐκεῖ] is wanting in A B C D $\aleph^*$ 17, Copt. Syr. Cyr. Nyss. Suspected by Griesb., deleted by Lachm. Tisch. and Rück. An addition of the copyists, who had in mind the current use elsewhere of ἐκεῖ after οὐ (Matt. xviii. 20, 24, 28; Jas. iii. 16 *al.*), an usage not found in Paul. See Rom. iv. 15, v. 20.

¹ [The T. R. here is rejected by Westcott and Hort and nearly all the later critics, and most justly, according to the weight of evidence.—T. W. C.]

CONTENTS.¹—This, again, is no recommendation of self ; for we need no letters of recommendation, since you yourselves are our letter of recommendation in the higher sense (vv. 1–3). But with this confidence we wish to ascribe our ability not to ourselves, but to God, far exalted over the old covenant, who has made us able as servants of the new covenant, (vv. 4–6). How glorious is this service compared with the service of Moses (vv. 7–11) ! Hence we discharge it boldly, not like Moses with his veil over his face (vv. 12, 13). By this veil the Jews were hardened ; for up to the present time they do not discern that the old covenant has ceased (vv. 14, 15). But when they are converted to Christ, they will come to unhindered discernment ; we Christians, in fact, all behold without hindrance the glory of Christ, and become ourselves partakers of it (vv. 16–18).

Ver. 1. *Ἀρχόμεθα*] namely, through what was said in ii. 17, regarding which Paul foresaw that his opponents would describe it as the beginning of another recommendation of himself. It is *interrogative*, not to be taken, with Hofmann, who then reads *ἢ μή*, as an *affirmation*, in which case a logical relation to the question that follows could only be brought out by importing something.²—*πάλιν*] belongs to *ἐαυτ. συνιστ.*, and refers to experiences, through which Paul must have passed already before, certainly also in respect to his last Epistle (1 Cor. i.–iv., v., ix., xiv. 17, *al.*), when the charge was made : *ἐαυτὸν συνιστάνει* ! As to the *reason why* he regards the *ἐαυτὸν συνιστάνειν* to be such a reproach, see x. 18. — In the *plural* he in this chapter includes also Timothy, as is clear from expressions such as immediately occur in ver. 2, *ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμ.*, and ver. 6, *ἡμᾶς διακόνους*. — *συνιστάνειν*] as at Rom. xvi. 1. Hence *ἐπιστολαὶ συστατικαὶ* or *γράμματα συστατικά* Arrian. *Epict.* ii. 3. 1 ; Diog. L. v. 18, viii. 87), *letters of recommendation*. Regarding their use in the ancient Christian church, see Suicer, *Thes.* II. p. 1194 ; Dought. *Anal.* II. p. 120. — *εἰ μὴ κ.τ.λ.*] *nisi*, i. e. *unless it possibly be, that*, etc. Only if this exigency takes place with us, can that *ἄρχονται πάλιν ἐαυτοὺς συνιστάνειν* be asserted of us. Such *epistolary* recommendations, indeed, we should not have, and hence we should have to resort to *self-praise* ! The expression is *ironical* in character, and contains an answer to that question, which reveals its absurdity. Comp. Xen. *Mem.* i. 2. 8. Hence *εἰ* is not to be taken, with Reiche, as *siquidem* or *quia*, and *μή* as negating the *χρήζομεν* (as if it were *εἰ οὐ χρήζ.*). — *ὥς τινες*] *as some people* (comp. 1 Cor. iv. 18, xv. 12 ; Gal. i. 7), certainly a side-glance at anti-Pauline teachers, who had brought to the Corinthians letters of recommendation, either from teachers of repute, or from churches,³ and had obtained similar letters from Corinth

¹ See on chap. iii., Krummel in the *Stud. und Krit.* 1859, p. 39 ff.

² The question that follows with *ἢ μή* would mean : “ *or do we not withal need ?* ” etc., which does not fit in with *ἀρχόμεθα* when taken as an affirmation. Hofmann, however, imports the thoughts : *whoever is offended at this*, that Paul has no scruple in recommending himself, *to him he offers to answer on his part the question, whether he and his official associates have any need of*

letters of recommendation.

³ According to Gal. ii. 7–9 but hardly from the *original apostles* or from the *church of Jerusalem* under their guidance as such. This, however, does not exclude the possibility that *individual members* of the mother-church may have given such letters. We do not know anything more precise on the point : even from *τινὲς ἀπὸ Ἰακώβου*, Gal. ii. 12 ff., nothing is to be inferred.

at their departure thence. — *πρὸς ὑμᾶς, ἢ ἐξ ὑμῶν*] In the former case, it might be thought that we wished to supply this need by recommendation of ourselves ; in the latter case (*ἢ ἐξ ὑμῶν*), that we, by our self-recommendation, wished to corrupt your judgment, and to induce you to recommend us to others. Both would be *absurd*, but this is just in keeping with the *irony*.

Ver. 2 f. This ironical excitement, ver. 1, is succeeded by earnestness and pathos. Paul, as conscious of his deserts in regard to the Corinthians as he is faithful to his Christian humility (see ver. 3), gives a skilful explanation of the thought contained in ver. 1 : we need no letters of introduction either to you or from you. — *ἡ ἐπιστολὴ ἡμῶν*] *i.e. the letter* (the letter of recommendation) *which we have*, have to show, namely, as well *to you* as *from you*. That we should understand both, is required by ver. 1, and to this vv. 2 and 3 are admirably suited, since what is said in them represents every letter of recommendation as well *to* the Corinthians as *from* them as superfluous. This in opposition to Flatt, Rückert, Osiander, and others, who are of opinion that Paul has reference merely to his previous *ἐξ ὑμῶν*, and (Rückert) that the *πρὸς ὑμᾶς* has been said only to hit his opponents. — *ὑμεῖς ἐστε*] in so far, namely, as your conversion, and your whole Christian being and life, is our work, redounding to our commendation. Comp. 1 Cor. ix. 2. — *ἐγγεγραμμ. ἐν ταῖς καρδ. ἡμ.*] A more precise definition of the manner of the *ἐπιστολὴ ἡμῶν* : *inscribed in our hearts*. This is the mode—adapted to the image—of conveying the thought : *since we have in our own consciousness the certainty of being recommended to you by yourselves and to others by you*. (B^A) That you yourselves are our recommendation (to yourselves and to others) our own hearts tell us, and it is known by all. Paul did not write *ὑμῶν*, as *ⲛ* and a few cursives, also the Ethiopic, have the reading, which Olearius, Emmerling, Flatt, and especially Rinck (*Lucubr. crit.* p. 160), recommend to our adoption : for in that case there would result an incongruity in the figurative conception, since the Corinthians themselves are the letter. Besides, there were so many malevolents in the church. But the apostle's *own good consciousness* was, as it were, the tablet on which this living Epistle of the Corinthians stood, and *that* had to be left unassailed even by the most malevolent. Of the *love* (comp. vii. 3 ; Phil. i. 7) of which Chrysostom and others explain *ἐν τ. καρδ. ἡμ.* (comp. Wetstein : “*quam tenero vos amore prosequar, omnes norunt*”), there is no mention in the whole context. Emmerling is wrong, however, also in saying that *ἐγγεγρ. ἐν τ. καρδ. ἡμ.* is equivalent to the mere *nobis inscriptae*, *i. e. quas ubique nobiscum gestamus, ut cognosci et legi ab omnibus possint*. Just because what is written stands *within in the consciousness*, *ἐν ταῖς καρδ. ἡμ.*¹ is used. — The *plural* is neither to be explained, with Billroth, from the analogy of *σπλάγχνα* (without such usage existing), nor to be considered with Rückert and de Wette as occa-

¹ Olshausen thinks strangely that Paul refers to the official badge which the high priest wore on his heart, and on whose twelve precious stones stood engraven the twelve names of the children of Israel. This arrangement, he holds, Paul takes in a spiritual sense, and applies it to the relation

of himself and other teachers to their spiritual children ; they bore the names of these engraven on their hearts, and brought them always in prayer before God.—Sheer fancifulness, since the context has nothing pointing to a reference so entirely peculiar.

sioned by the plural of the speaking person (to whom, however, the plural *hearts* would not be suitable), but Paul writes *in name of himself and of Timothy*. Comp. also iv. 6, vii. 3, and see Calvin, who, however, in an arbitrary way (see i. 1) includes Silvanus also (i. 19). — γινωσκομένη κ.τ.λ.] This appears to contradict the previous words, according to which the Epistle is written ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν; hence Fritzsche, *Diss.* I. p. 19 f. (Billroth follows him), says that Paul “nonnulla adjicere, in quibus *Corinthiorum potius, quam epistolae*, cum qua eos comparat, memor esse videatur.” But he rather presents the thing *as it is*, and hence cannot otherwise delineate the image of the Epistle in which he presents it, than *as it corresponds to the thing*. In so far, namely, as Paul and Timothy have *in their hearts* the certainty of being recommended by the Corinthians themselves, these are a letter of recommendation *which stands inscribed in the hearts of those teachers*; and yet, since from the whole phenomenon of the Christian life of the church it cannot remain unknown to any one *that* the Corinthians redound to the commendation of Paul and Timothy, and *how* they do so, this letter is *known* as what it is, and *read*¹ by all men. The Epistle has therefore *in fact* the two qualities, which in a letter proper would be contradictory, and the image is not confounded with the thing, but is adapted to the thing. Rückert, who likewise (see above) finds for ἐν τ. καρδ. the reference to the apostle’s love, explains it: “*In his heart they stand written . . . and where he himself arrives, there he, as it were, reads out this writing, when he from a loving heart gives forth tidings everywhere, what a prosperous church the Lord has gathered to Himself in Corinth.*” Comp. Chrysostom. But in that case the πάντες would not in fact be the readers—as yet they ought to be according to ὑπὸ πάντων ἀνθρ.—but Paul; and the thing would resolve itself into a self-recommendation, which is yet held to be disclaimed in ver. 1.

Ver. 3. Φανερούμενοι] attaches itself in construction to ὑμεῖς ἐστε, to which it furnishes a more precise definition, and that in elucidative reference to what has just been said γινωσκομένη . . . ἀνθρώπων: *since you are being manifested to be an epistle of Christ, i.e. since it does not remain hid, but becomes (continually) clear to every one that you, etc.* Comp. on the construction, 1 John ii. 19. — ἐπιστολῇ Χριστοῦ] genitivus *auctoris* (not of the *contents*—in opposition to Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Theophylact): a letter *composed* (dictated) *by Christ*. Fritzsche, *l.c.* p. 23, takes the genitive as *possessive*, so that the sense without figure would be: *homines Christiani estis*. But in what follows the whole *origin* of the Epistle is very accurately set forth, and should the *author* not be mentioned—not in that case be placed in front? Theodoret already gives the right view. — ἐπιστολῇ is here not again specially letter of recommendation (ver. 2), but letter in general; for through the characteristic: “you are an epistle of Christ, drawn up by us,” etc., the statement above: “you are our letter of recommendation,” is to be elucidated and made good. — In the following διακονηθεῖσα . . . σαρκίναίς Paul presents *himself and Timothy* as the *writers* of the epistle of Christ (διακον. ὑφ’ ἡμ.), the *Holy Spirit* as the means of writing in lieu of *ink*, and *human hearts, i.e.*

¹ Grotius: “prius agnoscitur manus, deinde legitur epistola.” Here γινωσκ. precedes; it is different in i. 13.

according to the context, *the hearts of the Corinthians*, as the *material* which is written upon. For *Christ was the author of their Christian condition; Paul and Timothy were His instruments for their conversion, and by their ministry the Holy Spirit became operative in the hearts of the readers.* In so far the Corinthians, in their Christian character, are as it were a letter which Christ has caused to be written, through Paul and Timothy, by means of the Holy Spirit in their hearts. On the passive expression διακονηθ. ἰφ' ἡμ., comp. viii. 19 f. ; Mark x. 45 ; note also the *change of the tenses*: διακονηθ. and ἐγγεγραμμ. (the epistle *is there ready*) ; likewise the designation of the Holy Spirit as πνεῦμα θεοῦ ζῶντος, comp. ver. 6. We may add that Paul has not mixed up heterogeneous traits of the figure of a letter begun in ver. 2 (Rückert and others), but here, too, he carries out this figure, *as it corresponds to the thing to be figured thereby.* The single *incongruity* is οὐκ ἐν πλαξὶ λιθίναις, in which he has not retained the conception of a *letter* (which is written on tablets of paper), but has thought generally of a *writing* to be read. Since, however, he has conceived of such writing as *divinely* composed (see above, πνεύματι θεοῦ ζῶντος), of which nature was the law of Sinai, the usual supposition is right, that he has been induced to express himself thus by the remembrance of the tables of the law (Heb. ix. 4 ; comp. Jer. xxxi. 31–33) ; for we have no reason to deny that the subsequent mention of them (ver. 7) was even now floating before his mind. Fritzsche, indeed, thinks that “accommodate ad nonnulla V. T. loca (Prov. iii. 3, vii. 3) cordis notionem per *tabulas cordis* expressurus erat, quibus tabulis carneis nihil tam commode quam *tabulas lapideas* opponere potuerit.” But he might quite as suitably have chosen an antithesis corresponding to the figure of a *letter* (2 John 12 ; 2 Tim. iv. 13) ; hence it is rather to be supposed that he came to use the expression *tabulae cordis*, just because he had before his mind the idea of the tables of the law. — The *antitheses* in our passage are intended to bring out that here an epistle is composed in quite another and higher sense than an ordinary letter (which one brings into existence μέλανι σπείρων διὰ καλάμου, Plato, *Phaedr.* p. 276 C)—a writing, which is not to be compared even with the Mosaic tables of the law. But the purpose of a contrast with the legalism of his opponents (Klöpfer) is not conveyed in the context. — That there is a special purpose in the use of σαρκίνας as opposed to λιθίνας, cannot be doubted after the previous antitheses. It must imply the notion of something *better* (comp. Ezek. xi. 19, xxxvi. 26), namely, the thought of the living receptivity and susceptibility : δεκτικὰς τοῦ λόγου (Theophylact, Calvin, Stolz, Flatt, de Wette, Osiander, Ewald, and others). The distinctive sense of σαρκινός is correctly noted by Erasmus : “ut *materiam* intelligas, non *qualitatem*.” Comp. on 1 Cor. iii. 1. Καρδίας is also the genitive of *material*, and the contrast would have been sufficiently denoted by ἀλλ' ἐν πλαξὶ καρδίας : it is, however, expressed more concretely and vividly by the added σαρκίνας : *in fleshy tablets of the heart.*

Ver. 4. Πεποίθῃσιν is emphatic, and therefore precedes (otherwise in i. 15) ; *confidence*, however, of such a kind as is indicated in vv. 2, 3 ;¹ for there

¹ [Not self-confidence, as is clearly shown by the next two verses.—T. W. C.]

Paul has expressed a lofty self-consciousness. Hence there is no reason for seeking a reference to something earlier instead of to what immediately precedes, and for connecting it with ii. 17 (Grotius and others, including de Wette ; comp. Rückert), or with ii. 14-17, as Hofmann has done in consequence of his taking ἀρχόμεθα in ver. 1 as not interrogative. Brief and apt is Luther's gloss : "Confidence, *that we have prepared you to form the epistle.*" — διὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ] *through Christ*, who brings it about in us : for in his official capacity Paul knows himself to be under the constant influence of Christ, without which he would not have that confidence. Theodoret says well : τοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦτο ἡμῖν δεδωκότος τὸ θάρσος. — πρὸς τὸν θεόν] *in relation to God*, as bringing about the successful results of the apostolic activity. It denotes the *religious direction*, in which he has such confidence (comp. Rom. iv. 2, v. 1), not the *validity before God* (de Wette).

Ver. 5. Now comes the caveat, for which ver. 4 has prepared the way, —the guarding against the possible objection, that Paul considered himself (and Timothy) as *originator* of the ability for apostolic working. οὐχ ὅτι is therefore not to be taken as equivalent to ὅτι οὐχ (Mosheim, Schulz, Emmerling), nor is πέποιθα to be supplied again after οὐχ (Emmerling) ; but we have here the quite common use of οὐχ ὅτι for οὐκ ἔρῳ, ὅτι. See on i. 24. Rückert finds in οὐχ ὅτι κ.τ.λ. a reason assigned for the πρὸς τὸν θεόν, or an explanation of it : "In thus speaking, I would not have it thought that," etc. But if in πρὸς τ. θεόν there was meant to be conveyed the same idea as was further explained in ver. 5, Paul would have expressed himself quite illogically, and in explaining or assigning a reason for it he must have written ὅτι οὐχ. No ; the course of thought is : "With this πεποίθησις, however, I do not wish to be misunderstood or misconstrued : I do not mean by it, that we are of ourselves sufficient," etc. With this connection πρὸς τὸν θεόν is not at variance ; for by it God was not yet meant as *author of the adequate ability* (ver. 5 shows this very point), but as *producer of the result*. — λογίσασθαι τι] *to judge anything (censere)*. The context furnishes the more precise definition which Paul had in view. Vv. 2-4, 6. He denies, namely, that of himself he possesses the ability to settle in his judgment the means and ways, and, in general, the *mode of discharging his apostolic duties*. If he has just been speaking in vv. 2-4 with so much confidence of his prosperous and successful labour in Corinth, yet it is by no means his own ability, but the divine empowering, which enables him to determine by his own judgment anything regarding the discharge of his vocation. Accordingly, we can neither approve the meaning arbitrarily given to τι, *aliquid praeclari* (Emmerling ; van Hengel, *Annot.* p. 219), nor agree with Hofmann, who, in consistency with his reference of πεποίθησις to ii. 14-17, makes the apostle guard against the misconstruction that this, his πεποίθησις, rests on *ideas which he forms for himself*—on an estimate of his official working, according to a standard *elaborated* by his own mind. Even apart from that erroneous reference of the πεποίθησις, the very expression ἱκανοί would be unsuitable to the meaning adopted by Hofmann, and instead of it a notion of *presumption* would rather have been in place ; the prominence given to ἱκανότης by its being used thrice can only concern the ability which regulates the

official labour itself. The dogmatic exposition, disregarding the context, finds here the entire inability of the natural man for all good. See Augustine, *de dono persever.* 13, *contra Pelag.* 8; Calvin: “non poterat magis hominem nudare omni bono.” Comp. Beza, Calovius, and others, including Olshausen. The reference also of the words to the *doctrinal contents* of the preaching, which was not derived from his own reflection (Theodoret, Grotius, de Wette, Neander, and others), is not suggested by the connection, and is forbidden by the fact that ἀφ’ ἐαυτῶν does not belong to λογίσασθαι at all (see below). This also in opposition to Osiander, who finds the meaning: “not human, but divine thoughts lie at the root of the whole of my official work.” — ἀφ’ ἐαυτῶν] has its assured place after λογίσ. τι (see the critical remarks). The contrast that follows (ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ) decides what it belongs to in sense,—namely, not to λογίσασθαι τι, but to ἱκανοὶ ἐσμεν,—so that ἱκανοὶ ἐσμεν λογίσασθαι τι is to be considered as *going together*, as one idea. Mistaking this, Rückert thinks that either Paul has placed the words wrongly, or the order given by B C 8 (see the critical remarks) must be preferred. — On ἀφ’ ἐαυτοῦ, *from one's own means, nemine suppeditante*, see Wetstein. — ὡς ἐξ ἐαυτῶν] sc. ἱκανοὶ ὄντες λογίσ. τι, a more precise definition of the ἀφ’ ἐαυτ. inserted on purpose (making the notice thoroughly exhaustive). The proceeding from (ἀπό) is still more definitely marked as causal procession (ἐκ): *as from ourselves*, i.e. *as if our ability to judge anything had its origin from ourselves*. Wolf arbitrarily refers ἀπό to the will, and ἐξ to the power; and Rückert wrongly connects ἐξ ἐαυτ. with λογίσ. τί; it is in fact parallel to ἀφ’ ἐαυτ. Paul is conscious of the ἱκανὸν εἶναι λογίσασθαι τι, and ascribes it to himself; but he denies that he has this ἱκανότης of himself, or from himself. — ἡ ἱκανότης ἡμῶν] sc. λογίσασθαι τι. — Rückert finds in our passage, especially in ἀφ’ ἐαυτῶν, an allusion to some utterances, unknown to us, of opponents, which, however, cannot be proved from x. 7, and is quite a superfluous hypothesis.

Ver. 6. Ὃς καὶ ἱκάνωσεν ἡμᾶς] ὃς, *he who*, in the sense of οὗτος γάρ. See Kühner, *ad Xen. Mem.* i. 2. 64; van Hengel, *Annot.* 220. And καί is the *also* of the corresponding relation (Baumlein, *Partik.* p. 152), so that there is expressed the agreement between what is contained in the relative clause and what was said before: *who also (qui idem, comp. Klotz, ad Devar.* p. 636) *has made us capable* (ἀρκοῦσαν ἐχωρήγησε δύναμιν, Theodoret) *as ministers*, etc. According to Bengel, Rückert (comp. also de Wette, Osiander, Hofmann), the sense is: “that God has bestowed on him not only the ability mentioned in ver. 5, but also the more comprehensive one of a διάκονος κ.τ.λ.” But in that case the words must have stood thus: ὃς καὶ διακόνους καινῆς διαθήκης ἱκάνωσεν ἡμᾶς. The notion of ἱκανότης is thrice put *in front* with the same emphasis. Of ἱκανόω (Col. i. 12) only the passive, in the sense of *to have enough*, occurs in the (later) Greek writers, such as Dion. Hal. ii. 74, and in the LXX. — διακόνους καινῆς διαθήκ.] *as ministers of a new covenant* (comp. Eph. iii. 7; Col. i. 23; 2 Cor. xi. 15; Luke i. 2), i.e. *to be such as serve a new covenant, as devote to it their activity*. Καιν. διαθ., without the article, is conceived *qualitatively*. The *new covenant* (Heb. xii. 24) of God with men, which is meant, is—in contrast to the one founded by Moses

—that established by Christ, in which the fulfilling of the law is no longer defined as the condition of salvation, but faith in the atonement by Christ, 1 Cor. xi. 25 ; Rom. x. 5 ff. ; Gal. iv. 24 ff. ; Matt. xxvi. 28. — οὐ γράμμα-τος, ἀλλὰ πνεῦμα.] is since Heumann usually (also by Billroth, Rückert, Ewald) regarded as governed by καινῆς διαθήκης (Rückert, “of a covenant, which offers not γράμμα, but πνεῦμα”), but without reason, since the sequel, by ἡ διακονία τοῦ θανάτου and ἡ διακ. τοῦ πνεύματος (vv. 7, 8), rather points to the fact that Paul has conceived οὐ γρ. ἀλλὰ πν. as dependent on διακόνους (so also de Wette, Neander, Osiander, Hofmann), as an appositional more precise definition to the καινῆς διαθήκης : *to be ministers not of letter* (which we would be as ministers of the old covenant), *but of spirit*. Γράμμα characterizes the Mosaic covenant *according to the specific manner in which it occurs and subsists*, for it is established and fixed in writing (by means of the written letter), and thereby—although it is divine, yet without bringing with it and communicating any principle of inward vital efficacy—settled as obligatory. On the other hand, πνεῦμα characterizes the *Christian* covenant, in so far as its distinctive and essential mode of existence consists in this, that the divine living power of the Holy Spirit is at work in it ; through this, and not through a written instrument, it subsists and fulfils itself. Comp. Rom. ii. 29, vii. 6 ; Heb. x. 29, viii. 7 ff. Not *letter* therefore, but *spirit*, is that to which the teachers of the gospel minister, the power, whose influence is advanced by their labours ;¹ οὐ γὰρ τὰ παλαιὰ τοῦ νόμου προσφέρομεν γράμματα, ἀλλὰ τὴν καινὴν τοῦ πνεύματος δωρεάν, Theodoret. It is true that the law also is in its nature πνευματικός (see on Rom. vii. 14), and its λόγια are ζῶντα (see on Acts vii. 38), but it is misused by the power of sin in man to his destruction, because it does not furnish the spirit which breaks this power. — τὸ γὰρ γράμμα ἀποκτείνει, τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα ζωοποιεῖ] specifies quite simply the *reason*, why God has made them capable of ministering not to the *letter*, but to the *spirit*. It is therefore quite unnecessary to presuppose, with Fritzsche, Billroth, and Rückert, a suppressed intermediate thought (namely, that the new covenant is far more excellent). We may add that the γὰρ does not extend also to what follows (vv. 7, 8), so as to make the sentence τὸ γράμμα κ.τ.λ. merely introductory to the sequel, and the whole a vindication of the apostle's referring his capacity of judgment to God. This view of Hofmann is connected with his interpretation of λογίσ. τι, ver. 5, and has besides against it the fact, that the weighty antithesis τὸ γ. γράμμα κ.τ.λ. is neither adapted to be a mere introductory thought, nor betokened as being such, the more especially as it contains completely in itself the ground establishing what immediately precedes, and with ver. 7 a new discussion begins, which runs on to the end of the chapter without a break. — ἀποκτείνει] does not refer to the *physical death* (Käuffer, ζωὴ αἰών. p. 75), in so far as that is the consequence of sin (Rom. v. 12), and sin is occasioned and furthered by the law (Rom. vii. 9 ff., vi. 23 ; 1 Cor. xv. 56, *al.*). Against this interpretation it is decisive that according to Rom. v. 12 ff.

¹ Bengel acutely and justly remarks : “Paulus etiam dum haec scripsit, non literae, sed spiritus ministrum egit. Moses

in proprio illo officio suo, etiam cum haud scripsit, tamen in litera versatus est.”

(see *in loc.*) bodily death is the consequence, extending to all, of *Adam's sin*, and has, since Adam, reigned over all even *before the law*. Nor yet are we to understand *spiritual* (Billroth), *ethical* (de Wette, Krummel), or *spiritual and bodily death* (Rückert), or the mere *sensus mortis* (Bengel, comp. Neander), but according to Rom. vi. 21, 23, vii. 5, 9, 10, 11, 13, 24, *eternal death*,¹ the opposite of the *eternal life*, which, by means of the Holy Spirit becoming operative in the heart through the gospel, is brought about for man who is liable to eternal death (Rom. viii. 2, 6, 10, 11)—which here (comp. John vi. 63) is expressed by τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα ζωοποιεῖ, comp. on ii. 16. *How far* the law works eternal death, is shown from Rom. vii. 5, 7 ff.; comp. 1 Cor. xv. 56. Through its prohibitions, namely, it becomes for the power of sin in man the occasion of awakening evil desire, and therewith transgression sets in and the imputing of it for condemnation, whereby man is liable to eternal death, and that by means of the curse of the law which heaps up sin and produces the divine anger, see on ver. 9; Gal. iii. 10. Comp. Rom. iv. 15, v. 20. After Chrysostom and his followers (also Ambrosiaster), Grotius explains it as: “morte violenta punit peccatores,” and Fritzsche: “lex supplicia sumit.” This is to be rejected, because in this way the law would not be the very thing that kills, but only that which determines death as a punishment; and consequently no corresponding contrast to ζωοποιεῖ would result. Finally, we can only consider as historically remarkable the interpretation of Origen regarding the literal and mystical *sense of Scripture*, the former of which is injurious, the latter conducive, to salvation. Something similar is still to be found in Krause and Royaards. Against the visionaries, who referred γράμμα to the *outward* and πνεῦμα to the *inward* word, see Calovius.

Ver. 7. Δε] leads on to a setting forth of the great glory of the Christian ministry, which is proved from the splendour of the ministry of Moses by a conclusion *a minori ad majus*.² — ἡ διακονία τοῦ θανάτου] i.e. *the ministry conducing to the rule of death*; for τὸ γράμμα ἀποκτείνει, ver. 6. It is not the law itself that is *meant*, but the *ministry of Moses*, which he accomplished by bringing down to the people the tables of the law from Sinai. Rückert erroneously thinks that the *whole ministry of the Levitical priesthood* is meant, against which what follows is clearly decisive. The *reason* assigned by

¹ With this is connected certainly *moral death* (the negation of the moral life), but only the *eternal death* is here *meant*, which is the consequence of the κατάκρισις, ver. 9. This in opposition to Osiander. Nor is the ἀποκτείνει meant of the letter *conditionally* (“so soon as we abide by it alone and deify it”), but the killing is the specific operation of the law; how? see Rom. vii. 9 f.; 1 Cor. xv. 56. This in opposition to Ewald.—Hofmann unites the various meanings of the *death* to which the sinner is liable, inasmuch as he defines the notion as “*the existence of the whole man shut out from the life of God and for ever.*” This *collective* definition of

the notion, however, does not relieve us from the labor of showing from the various contexts in what *special* sense death and dying are conceived of in the several passages.

² Without doubt this whole comparison of the ministry of the New Testament with that of Moses (vv. 7–11), as well as the subsequent shadow which is thrown on the conduct of Moses (ver. 13), and the digression on the obstinacy of the Jews (vv. 14–18), is not put forward without a special purpose, but is an indirect polemic against the Judaists. Comp. Chrysostom: ὅρα πῶς πάλιν ὑποτίθεται τὸ φρόνημα τὸ Ἰουδαϊκόν.

Rückert, that Moses as μεσίτης τῆς παλ. διαθήκης can only be treated as on a parallel with Christ, and not with the apostles, is not valid, since in the context the prevailing conception is not that of μεσίτης but that of διάκονος, and as such Moses is certainly parallel to the ministers of the new covenant. — ἐν γράμμασιν ἐντετυπ. λίθοις] A comma is not to be put after γράμμ. (Luther, Beza, Piscator, Estius, and others, including Schrader and Ewald), which would require the repetition of the article before ἐν γρ., and would make the sentence drag ; but it is : *which was imprinted on stones by means of letters*. The death-promoting ministry of Moses was really *graven on stones*, in so far as the Decalogue engraven on the two tables was actually the ministerial document of Moses, as it were the registration of his office. In this case ἐν γράμμασιν is not something of an idle addition (in opposition to de Wette, who defends the reading ἐν γράμματι, and attaches it to τοῦ θανάτου), but in fact an element emphatically prefixed, in keeping with the process of argument *a minori*, and *depicting* the inferior unspiritual character. Rückert (forced by his reference to the service of the Levitical priesthood) erroneously thinks that Paul means not only the tables of the law, *but the whole Pentateuch*, and that he has been not quite so exact in his use of the expression (ἐντετυπ. λίθοις !). — ἐγενήθη ἐν δόξῃ] *took place in splendour*, was surrounded by splendour, full of splendour, see Buttmann, *neut. Gram.* p. 284 [E. T. 330]. Bengel says rightly : “nacta est gloriam ; γίνομαι fio, et εἶμι sum, ver. 8. differunt.” Comp. Fritzsche in *Fritzschor. Opusc.* p. 284. It relates to the external radiance, which in the intercourse with God on Sinai passed from the divine glory (Ex. xxiv. 16) to the countenance of Moses, so that he descended from the mountain with his face shining (Ex. xxxiv. 29 ff.). For a Rabbinical fiction that this splendour was from the light created at the beginning of things, see Eisenmenger, *Entdeckt. Judenth.* I. p. 369 f. Others (Vatablus, and more recently, Flatt, Billroth, Rückert) take ἐν δόξῃ, not of that glorious radiance, but of *grandeur, glory in general*. So also de Wette and Hofmann. But this is opposed to the context, for in what follows it is not merely a visible *proof* of the δόξα which is adduced (as Rückert thinks), or a concrete *representation* of it (Hofmann), but the high *degree* (ὥστε) of the very δόξα *which is meant* by ἐγενήθη ἐν δόξῃ. It is said, indeed, that ver. 8, where the glory spoken of is no external one, does not admit of our reference. But even in ver. 8 the δόξα is an external glory (see on ver. 8) ; and further, we have here an argument *a minori ad majus*, in which every reader was *historically aware* that the *minus*, the δόξα of Moses, was an *external* one, while as to the *majus*, the δόξα of the ministry of the N.T., it was self-evident that it is before the Parousia merely something ideal, a spiritual possession, and only becomes also an external reality after the Parousia (and to this ver. 8 applies). — ὥστε μὴ δύνασθαι κ.τ.λ.] Philo gives the same account, *Vit. Mos.* p. 665 A ; Ex. xxxiv. has only : ἐφοβήθησαν ἐγγίσαι αὐτῷ, which was more precisely explained by that statement. — διὰ τὴν δόξαν τοῦ πρ. αὐτ.] would have been *in itself* superfluous, but with the addition τὴν καταργ. strengthening the conclusion it has a solemn emphasis. Philo, *l.c.*, calls this δόξα : ἡλιοειδὲς φέγγος, — τὴν καταργουμένην] “Claritas illa vultus Mosis transitoria erat et modici temporis,” Estius. Ex. *l.c.* gives us

no express information of this ; but ver. 13 clearly shows that Paul regarded the radiance which Moses brought down from his converse with God as only temporary and gradually ceasing, which, indeed, is self-evident and correctly inferred from the renewal of the radiance on each occasion. In this passing away of that lustre,—which even during its passing away was yet so great that the Israelites could not gaze fixedly on him,—Paul undoubtedly (in opposition to Hofmann) found a type of the ceasing of the Mosaic ministry (ver. 13); but in our present passage this is only hinted at in a preliminary way by the historical addition τ. καταργ., without the latter ceasing to belong to the historical narration. Hence the participle is not to be taken, with Vulgate, Luther, Calvin, and others, including Rückert, in a purely present sense : “ *which yet ceases*,” nor in the sense of *transient* (Ewald), but as the imperfect participle ; the transitory, *which was in the act of passing away*.

Ver. 8. *The ministry dedicated to the Holy Spirit, i.e. forming the medium of His operation (the teaching ministry of the gospel), is as such the specific opposite of the διακονία τοῦ θανάτου ἐν γράμμασιν ἐντετυπ. λίθοις, ver. 7. In τοῦ πνεύματος are contained the elements of contrast. See ver. 6. — ἐσται] is not the future of the inference (Billroth, Hofmann, and the older commentators) ; nor does it refer to the advancing steady development (Osiander), but rather to the gloria futuri seculi. Comp. on ver. 12, where the δόξα—which is therefore not to be understood, as it usually is, of inner elevation and dignity—appears as the object of the ἐλπς. We cannot therefore say with Bengel : “ loquitur ex prospectu V. T. in Novum,” but : loquitur ex prospectu praesentis seculi in futurum.*

Ver. 9. Grounding, simply by a characteristic change of the predicates (κατακρ. and δικαιοσύνη.), of what was said in vv. 7, 8. Comp. Rom. v. 18, 19. — ἡ διακονία τῆς κατακρίσ.] *the ministry, which is the medium of condemnation.* For the ministry of Moses, which communicated the Decalogue, promoted through the law sin (Rom. vii. 9 ff.), whose power it became (1 Cor. xv. 56), and thus realized the divine curse against the transgressors of the law (Gal. iii. 20). Comp. on ver. 6. The article denoted the well-known, solemn condemnation, Deut. xxvii. 26. — δόξα] *sc. ἐστι*, for the former ἐγε-νήθη ἐν δόξῃ is realized as present, regarded as present. Comp., subsequently, the present περισσεύει. The substantive δόξα (it refers, as in ver. 7, to that external glory) stands as predicate in the sense of ἐνδοξος, denoting the notion of the adjective *more strongly*, according to a current usage in Greek. Rom. viii. 10 ; John vi. 63 ; 1 John iv. 8, *al.* See Abresch, *Auctar. Diluc.* p. 275 f. ; Fritzsche, *ad Rom.* II. p. 120. — περισσεύει] The tense realizes as present what is future ; for the future glory of the teacher is already now an ideal possession. Note the accumulated strength of the expression : *is in much higher degree superabundant in glory.* On the dative of more precise definition with περισσεύειν, comp. 1 Thess. iii. 12 ; Acts xvi. 5 ; Polyb. xviii. 18. 5 ; Plut. *Mor.* p. 708 F. Usually in the N. T. with ἐν, as also here in Elzevir. — ἡ διακονία τῆς δικαιοσύνης.] *the ministry, which is the medium of righteousness*¹ (comp. xi. 15) ; for it is the office of gospel teaching to preach the

¹ Note the contrast of κατάκρισις and δικαιοσύνη. The former is an *actus forensis* ; so-

faith in Jesus Christ, by which we have righteousness before God. See Rom. i. 17, iii. 22 ff., 30, x. 4 ; Gal. iii. 13. Comp. especially, v. 21.

Ver. 10. A more precise grounding of the previous πολλῶ μᾶλλον περισσεύει κ.τ.λ. by the highest climax of this relation. *For even* (καὶ γάρ) *that which is glorious is without glory in this point by reason of the superabundant glory.* — οὐ δεδοξασται] The chief element is prefixed, and combined into *one* idea (Hartung, *Partikell.* I. p. 122 ; Baeuml. p. 278) : *gloria destitutum est.* The *perfect* denotes the continuance of what had taken place ; Kühner, II. p. 70. — τὸ δεδοξασμένον] is referred to the *Mosaic religious economy* by Emmerling and Olshausen, following older expositors, quite against the context. Most refer it to the *ministry of Moses*, which had been made glorious through the radiance on his countenance, vv. 7–9. But see below. — ἐν τούτῳ τῷ μέρει] *in this respect* (ix. 3 ; 1 Pet. iv. 16 ; Col. ii. 16 ; often in Greek authors), is joined with τὸ δεδοξασμένον by Fritzsche, *l.c.* p. 31 (also de Wette and Ewald) : “*quod collustratum fuit hac parte h. e. ita, ut per splendorem, qui in Mosis facie conspiciebatur, illustre redderetur.*” But on the one hand—supposing that τὸ δεδοξασμ. denotes the ministry of Moses—the ἐν τούτῳ τῷ μέρει so taken would be an utterly superfluous addition, since the reader would already have had full information in accordance with the context through τὸ δεδοξασμ. having the article ; on the other hand, we should expect τούτῳ to point to something said just before, which, however, is not the case, since we must go back as far as ver. 7. If, again, with Ewald, we take ἐν τούτῳ τῷ μέρει as “*in all that is Jewish*, apart from what is Christian,” and refer it to the then still subsisting state of the temple, synagogue, etc., how enigmatically Paul would have expressed himself, without any hint of his meaning in the context ! Following Chrysostom (κατὰ τὸν τῆς συγκρίσεως λόγον) and Theodoret (ἀποβλέπων εἰς τούτους, namely, to the ministers of the N. T.), most commentators (including Billroth, Olshausen, Osiander, Hofmann) join it with οὐ δεδοξ., so that it would indicate the reference in which the sentence οὐ δεδοξ. τὸ δεδοξ. holds good (see Hofmann), and consequently would have the meaning : “*over against the office of Moses.*” But how utterly superfluous, and in fact cumbrous, would this ἐν τούτῳ τῷ μερ. be if so taken, especially seeing that there still follows ἐνεκεν τ. ὑπερβ. δοξ., which serves to throw light upon the relation asserted ! How surprising would this amplification be at this very point, where the comparison is carried to the highest pitch, and the representation is so forcibly and pithily begun by the oxymoron οὐ δεδοξ. τὸ δεδοξ. ! Rückert (following Flatt) connects also with οὐ δεδοξασται, but explains it : *in this respect*, that is, *in so far as the first διακονία was the διακονία τῆς κατακρίσεως.* At variance with the connection. For not in so far as the Mosaic διακονία ministered to condemnation and death, is its splendour darkened, but in so far as its splendour is outshone by a far greater splendour,—that of the διακονία of the N. T. Besides, if the assumed reference of ἐν τούτῳ τῷ μέρει were to be held correct, the κατάκρισις would necessarily be the principal element (pred-

also the latter, constituted by the divine act of the δικαίωσις (Rom. iv. 25, v. 18), rests

on imputation. Comp. v. 21. This in opposition to Hofmann, *Schriftbew.* I. p. 627 f.

icate) in what precedes, not merely an attributive definition of the subject. On the whole, the following explanation, against which none but quite irrelevant objections¹ are made, seems to be the right one : ἐν τούτῳ τῷ μέρει is certainly to be connected with οὐ δεδοξασται ; τὸ δεδοξασμένον, however, is not to be taken as a designation of the Mosaic διακονία *in concreto*, but signifies *that which is glorified generally, in abstracto* ; so that, in addition to the οὐ δεδοξασται said of it, there is also given with ἐν τούτῳ τῷ μέρει the reference to the particular concrete thing of which the apostle is speaking, the reference to the ministry of Moses, namely, thus : “*for in this respect, i.e. in respect of the relation of glory in which the Mosaic διακονία stands to the Christian (ver. 9), it is even the case that what is glorified is unglorified.*” Analogously, the δόξα of the moon, for instance, is no δόξα, when the δόξα of the sun beams forth (1 Cor. xv. 14). — ἐνεκεν τῆς ὑπερβαλλ. δόξης] *by reason of* (Stallbaum, *ad Plat. Rep.* p. 329 B) *the superabundant glory*, which obscures the δεδοξασμένον, exhibits its δόξα as relatively no δόξα. This applies to the future glory of the N. T. διακονία, setting in at the αἰὼν μέλλων, but already conceived as present.

Ver. 11. A justification of the foregoing expression τῆς ὑπερβαλλ. δόξης by a general proposition, the application of which in conformity with the connection is left to the reader, and the truth of which in this connection lies in the idea of the completion, which the facts of salvation in the O. T. have to find in the kingdom of God. “*For if that which ceases is glorious, much more is that which abides glorious.*” — τὸ καταργούμενον] *that which is in the act of passing away*. This the reader was to apply to the διακονία of Moses² spoken of in vv. 7–10, in so far, namely, as this ministry is in the course of its abolition through the preaching of the gospel by means of the διακονία τῆς δικαιοσύνης. Moses ceases to be lawgiver, when the gospel is preached ; for see Rom. x. 4. That this is the application intended by Paul, is confirmed by the contrast τὸ μένον, which the reader was to apply to *the teaching ministration of the N. T.* (not to the Christian religion, as Emmerling and Flatt, following older commentators, think), in so far, namely, as that ministration is not abolished, but continues on to the Parousia (whereupon its glory sets in). Fritzsche is of opinion that the διακονία of Moses is τὸ καταργούμενον for the reason : “*quod ejus fulgor muneris Christiani gloria superatur, et ita sane καταργεῖται, nullus redditur.*” But in that case the subject of καταργεῖται, would in fact be the splendour, not the διακονία itself. This applies at the same time in opposition to Billroth, who refers τὸ καταργ. to the lustre of Moses’ office on each occasion soon disappearing, which is impossible on account of διὰ δόξης. — διὰ δόξης] *sc. ἐστι.* διὰ expresses the situation, condition, and so is a circumlocution for the adjective. Stallbaum, *ad Plat. Phileb.* p. 192 ; Bernhardt, p. 235 ; Fritzsche, *ad Rom.* I. p. 138.

¹ The objection made by Osiander is a dilemma logically incorrect. Hofmann urges that ἐν τούτῳ τῷ μέρει cannot mean : *in this case*. But it is not at all alleged to have that meaning, but rather : *in this point*, i.e. *hoc respectu*, in the relation under discussion. See on this adverbial usage, C. Fr. Herm. *ad*

Lucian. hist. conser. p. 8.

² Not to the *Mosaic religion in general*, which ceases through Christ (Theodoret, Theophylact, and many others, including Emmerling and Flatt),—which is quite at variance with the context. See vv. 7–10.

ἐν δόξῃ (ver. 7) is not different in sense ; but the supposition of Estius, Billroth, Olshausen, Osiander, Neander, Hofmann, that διὰ indicates only what is transient, and ἐν what is abiding, is mere fancy. Paul is fond of varying the prepositions in designating *the same* relation. Comp. Rom. iii. 30, v. 10, xv. 2 ; Gal. ii. 16 ; Philem. 5. Comp. also Kühner, II. p. 319.

Ver. 12. Ἐχοντες οὖν τοιαύτ. ἐλπ.] οὖν, *accordingly*, namely, after what has just been said πολλῶ μᾶλλον τὸ μένον ἐν δόξῃ, *sc. ἐστι*. Since the ἐλπίς has its object necessarily in the future, and not yet in the present (Rom. viii. 24), τοιαύτη ἐλπίς cannot denote the *consciousness of the abiding glory of his office*, which Paul possesses (Hofmann ; comp. Erasmus and others), but it must be the apostle's great hope,—a hope based on *the future of the Messiah's kingdom*—that the ministry of the gospel would not fail at the Parousia of its glory far surpassing the δόξα of the ministry of Moses. This will be the glorious, superabundant reward of the labour of Christ's δοῦλοι, as promised by their Master (Luke xxii. 29 ff. ; John xiv. 3 ; Matt. xxv. 14 ff., *al.*). Comp. 1 Cor. iii. 14, iv. 5 ; 2 Cor. i. 14 ; Phil. ii. 16 ; 1 Thess. ii. 19 f. It is the ἄφθαρτος στέφανος of the faithful labour in teaching, 1 Cor. ix. 25 ff. ; 2 Tim. iv. 8 ; 1 Pet. v. 4. The reference to *the contents of the teaching* (Emmerling : “ tale munus quum habeam tantorum honorum spem ostendens”), to which Rückert is also inclined, is opposed to the words used and to the context. As little are we to assume, with Neander, an equalization of the ἐλπίς with the πεποίθησις, ver. 4, and a linking on of the thought to ver. 4. — πολλῇ παρρησίᾳ χρώμ.] denotes the frank unreservedness and openness towards those with whom the teacher has to do : μετ' ἐλευθερίας πανταχοῦ φθεγγόμεθα, οὐδὲν ἀποκρυπτόμενοι, οὐδὲν ὑποστελλόμενοι, οὐδὲν ὑφορώμενοι, ἀλλὰ σαφῶς λέγοντες, Chrysostom. The *evidentia* (Beza, comp. Mosheim) or *perspicuitas* (Castalio) belongs to this, but does not exhaust the idea. On χρώμ. παρρησ., comp. Plato, *Epr.* 8, p. 354 A ; *Phaedr.* p. 240 E ; χρώμ. is *utimur*, not *utamur* (Erasmus).

Ver. 13. A negative amplification of the πολλῇ παρρησίᾳ χρώμεθα by comparison with the opposite conduct of Moses. — καὶ οὐ] *sc. τίθεμεν κάλυμμα ἐπὶ τὸ πρόσωπον ἡμῶν*, according to the Greek way of putting the verb, which is common to the principal and subordinate clause, in the subordinate clause, and adapting it to the subject of that clause. See Heindorf, *ad Gorg.* p. 592 A ; Winer, p. 542 [E. T. 728] ; Kühner, II. p. 609. The *meaning* of the allegorical language is : “ *and we do not go to work veiling ourselves* (dissembling), *as Moses did, veiling his countenance, that the Israelites might not,*” etc. See Ex. xxxiv. 33–35. — πρὸς τὸ μὴ ἀτενίσαι κ.τ.λ.] the *purpose*, which Moses had in veiling his radiant face while he spoke to the people : the people were not (as they would otherwise have done) to fix their gaze on the τέλος τοῦ καταργουμένου (see below). In order to free Moses from a dissimulation, Wolf explained it : “ *ut indicaretur eos non posse intueri,*” which, however, is not conveyed in the words, and is not to be supported by Luke xviii. 1 ; and Schulz and Flatt, following older commentators, explain that πρὸς κ.τ.λ. means *so that*, etc., which, however, is wrong both as to the usage of the words (comp. Fritzsche, *ad Matth.* v. 28, p. 231) and as to the connection of ideas, since the πολλῇ παρρ. χρ. of ver. 12 presupposes

the *intentional* character of the opposite procedure. The latter remark applies also in opposition to de Wette (comp. before him, Beza and Calvin), who takes *πρὸς κ.τ.λ.* not of the intention, but of the *divine aim*, according to the well-known Biblical teleology, in which the result is regarded as aimed at by God, Isa. vi. 9 ; Matt. xiii. 11 ff. ; Luke viii. 10. In this way a conscious concealment on the part of Moses is removed ; but without sufficient ground, since that concealment must not have been regarded by Paul as *immoral* ("fraudulenter," Fritzsche), and with his reverence for the holy lawgiver and prophet cannot have been so regarded, but rather, in keeping with the preparatory destination of the Mosaic system, as a *paedagogic* measure which Moses adopted according to God's command, but the purpose of which falls away with the emergence of that which is abiding, *i.e.* of the ministry of the gospel (Gal. iv. 1 ff.). Finally, the argument of usage is also against de Wette, for in the N. T. by the telic *πρὸς τό* and infinitive there is never expressed the objective, divinely-arranged aim (which is denoted by *ἵνα* and *ὅπως*), but always the subjective purpose, which one has in an action (Matt. v. 28, vi. 1, xiii. 30, xxiii. 5 ; Mark xiii. 22 ; Eph. vi. 11 ; 1 Thess. ii. 9 ; 2 Thess. iii. 8 ; Jas. iii. 3, Elzevir ; also Matt. xxvi. 12). The *point of comparison* is the "*tecte agere*" (Fritzsche), which was done by Moses with the purpose specified *through* the veiling of his face (not through *the figures* in which he veiled the truth, as de Wette, following Mosheim, imports), but *is not done* by the teachers of the gospel, since they go to work in their ministry freely and frankly (ver. 12). The context furnishes nothing further than this, not even what Hofmann finds in the κ. οὐ καθ'απ. Μ. κ.τ.λ.¹ As little are we to suppose arbitrarily, with Klöpffer, that Paul had in mind not so much Moses himself as his successors (?), the *Judaists*.—*εἰς τὸ τέλος τοῦ καταργ.*] τὸ τέλος, by its very connection with τοῦ καταργ., is fixed to the meaning *end*, and not final *aim* (Osiander) or *completion* ;² and τοῦ καταργ. must be the same as was meant by τὸ καταργούμενον in the application intended by Paul of the general proposition in ver. 11. Consequently it cannot be *masculine* (Luther, Vatablus ; even Rückert is not disinclined to this view), nor can it denote the *Mosaic religion*, the end of which is Christ [Rom. x. 4], as, following Chrysostom, Theodoret, and Theophylact, most expositors, including Flatt and Osiander, think, against which, however, even Moses' own prophecy (Deut. xviii. 15), according to the Messianic interpretation then universal, would militate ; but it must be *the ministry of Moses, which is passing away*, see on ver. 11. The Israelites were not intended, in Paul's opinion, at that time to contemplate the end of this ministry,

¹ "If the apostle had found his calling only in publishing to others *traditional doctrines*, he would have thought, like Moses, that he must carefully distinguish between what he *was* and what he had to *teach*, that he must keep his *person* in subordination to his *task*, in order not . . . to injure the effect of what he taught."

² So Isenberg in the *Luther. Zeitschr.* 1867, p. 240 ff., who, regarding τοῦ καταργ. as the

genitive of *apposition*, brings out the sense : "the transitory office of the O. T. *as the completion*, after which no other institution could be expected." Thus there is ascribed to Moses exactly the opposite of what the simple words say ; Paul would have written something like *εἰς τὸ καταργούμενον ὡς τὸ τέλειον*. The genitive of *apposition* would here give the meaningless thought : "the end, which is the transitory."

which was to cease through the ministry of the gospel; therefore Moses veiled his face.¹ *By what means* (according to the apostle's view), if Moses had not veiled himself, they would have seen the end of his office, is apparent from ver. 7, namely, by the disappearance of the splendour, the departure of which would have typically presented to them the termination of the *διακονία* of Moses.² But not on this account are we to explain (with the scholiast in Matthaei and others, including Stolz, Billroth, Olshausen, de Wette, Ewald,³ Hofmann) τὸ καταργ. of the transient *splendour itself* (ver. 7), which is forbidden by ver. 11, and would be a confusion of the type and antitype.

Vv. 14–18. Sad contrast which the procedure of the preachers of the gospel indicated in vv. 12, 13—so wholly different from the procedure of Moses—meets with in the hardening of Israel. How far off are they to this day from divine freedom! how altogether different, however (ver. 18), it is with us Christians!

Ver. 14. Ἀλλ' ἐπωρώθη κ.τ.λ.] This ἀλλά does not refer to the thought implied in the previous πρὸς τὸ μὴ ἀτενίσαι κ.τ.λ., that the Jews did not contemplate the end of the Mosaic ministry, for this was made impossible to them, in fact, by Moses himself and according to his own intention. What Billroth imports into ἀλλά is therefore also unsuitable: "*but instead thereof were hardened,*" etc. Flatt, Rückert, de Wette, Hofmann (comp. also Olshausen) take the connection rightly, *that over against the utterance treating of the holders of the apostolic office, ver. 12 f. stands, that which speaks of Israel.* Accordingly ἀλλά is at, nevertheless. — ἐπωρώθη] Paul does not here say *by whom* this certainly passive (in opposition to Theodoret) hardness of heart⁴

¹ Paul deviates, therefore, from the representation of Ex. xxxiv. in not abiding simply by the statement, that Moses veiled his face because the eyes of the Israelites could not endure the radiance—but, in connection with his typological way of regarding the fact, apprehends it in the sense that Moses was induced to veil himself by the *subjective* motive of keeping out of the people's sight the end of his ministry of law. (F⁴)

² It might be objected to our whole explanation, that, if Moses had not veiled himself, the people would still not have read the end of the Mosaic ministry from the departing splendour (Billroth), nay, that Moses himself did not find anything of the kind in it. But we have not here a supplement of the account in Ex. xxxiv. (Krummel), but a rabbinic-allegorical exposition (שׁרר) of the circumstances, which as such is withdrawn from historical criticism, but nevertheless is in accordance with the striking aim which the apostle has in view. This aim was to make the παρρησία of the stewardship of the gospel-ministry conspicuous by contrast, like the light by shadow. (G⁴)

³ Who explains it as if not εἰς τὸ τέλος τοῦ καταργ., but simply εἰς τὸ καταργούμενον, were used. Ewald conceives the disappearance of the splendour as ensuing gradually during the age, and finally at the death of Moses, as Grotius also on ver. 7 represents it.

⁴ πωροῦσθαι means *to be made hard* (from the substantive πῶρος) not *to be blinded*, as Schleusner (*Thes.* IV. p. 541) and others, following the Fathers, and also Hofmann would take it, since there is no trace at all of the use among the Greeks of an adjective πωρός, *blind*, which the etymol. Gud. and Suidas quote. The Greeks have πῆρος, *blindness*, and πῆρος, *blind*, but not πωρός. And if the LXX. translate כָּהֵן, Job vii. 7, by πωροῦσθαι, and Zech. xi. 17 by ἐκτυφλοῦσθαι (to which Hofmann makes appeal), this proves nothing in favour of that explanation of πωροῦσθαι, since the LXX. very often, with exegetical freedom, render the same word differently according to the context. We may add that Hofmann irrelevantly compares Lucian, *Amor.* 46, where πηροί does not mean *blind* at all, but has its fundamental meaning *maimed*. The passage in Lucian means: "*To whom are the glances of*"

has been caused. It may be conceived as produced *by God* (Rom. xi. ff., comp. John xii. 39 f.; Acts xxviii. 26) just as well as by *the devil* (iv. 4, comp. Matt. xiii. 19), these two ways of regarding it not being contradictory to each other. The *aorist* denotes the hardness of heart which set in later *after* their intercourse with Moses, but in connection with the insight then rendered impossible to them. Πεπώρωται would have meant something else. On νοήματα, *thoughts*, the products of the νοῦς, of the exercise of the theoretic and practical reason, which, through the hardness of heart, become inaccessible to, and insusceptible of, the perception of the divine, comp. on Phil. iv. 7. — ἀχρι γὰρ κ.τ.λ.] A proof, in accordance with experience, for what was just said ἐπωρώθη κ.τ.λ. — τὸ αὐτὸ κάλυμμα ἐπὶ κ.τ.λ.] *The same veil* is, of course, to be understood, not of material identity, but symbolically of the likeness of the spiritual hindrance. Without figure the meaning is : *the same incapacity for recognizing the end of the Mosaic ministry, which was produced among them then by the veil of Moses, remains with them to this day when the Old Covenant is read.* — ἐπὶ τῇ ἀναγνώσει] Paul conceives the public reading of the O. T. every Sabbath (Acts xv. 21) as overlaid with the veil hindering knowledge ; still we need not assume, with Wolf, Michaelis, Semler, and others, a reference to the כִּלְתָּוִי (see Lakemacher, *Obs.* III. p. 209 ff.) with which the Jews veiled themselves at the reading of the law and at prayer, because otherwise Paul must have made the veil fall on the countenances of the Jews, and not on the public reading. But he has conceived to himself the matter so, that the *public reading* takes place under the veil enwrapping this act, so that in this reading the Jews remain shut out from insight into the new covenant. Vv. 13 and 15 preclude us from abandoning the *local* signification of ἐπί, *on*. The explanation, “*when there is public reading*” (Hofmann), confuses the *meaning* with the sensuous, but in relation to the context appropriate, *form of presenting* it. — τῆς παλ. διαθήκης] For when the law of Moses is publicly read, there is read the *old covenant* (comp. on ver. 6) therein set forth. This is the *contents* of the public reading. Comp. ver. 15 : ἀναγινώσκεται Μωϋσῆς. Ἡ παλ. διαθ. does not mean the *books of the O. T.*, as is here usually supposed. — μὴ ἀνακαλυπτόμενον, ὅτι ἐν Χ. καταργεῖται] These words in themselves admit of two explanations ; the first refers the participle and καταργεῖται to τὸ κάλυμμα, and takes ὅτι in the sense of *because*, as specifying the ground of the μὴ ἀνακαλ. (so most of the older expositors, and recently Fritzsche, Billroth, Schrader, Olshausen, de Wette, Neander, Hofmann, comp. Ewald) : *without being uncovered, because it is annihilated in Christ* (the veil), but Christ is not preached to them. On ἀνακαλύπτειν κάλυμμα, *to uncover a veil*, comp. LXX. Deut. xxii. 30 : οὐκ ἀνακαλύψαι συγκάλυμμα τοῦ πατρός. But against this view (a) καταργεῖται seems decisive, which, according to the context (see vv. 11, 13), cannot apply to the taking away of the veil, but only to the abolition of the Mosaic ministry, or according to the connection of ver. 14, to the abolition of the old covenant, which is the object of the Mosaic ministry

the eyes so blind (τυφλοὶ), and *the thoughts of the understanding so lame* (πηροί)?” Here πηροί is a figurative expression for *weakness*.

(comp. also Rom. iii. 31 ; Eph. ii. 15) ; and hence Paul, ver. 16, does not use καταργεῖται of the removal of the veil, but περιαιρεῖται, which signifies the same thing as ἀνακαλύπτεται. (b) If μὴ ἀνακαλυπτόμενον were to refer to τὸ αὐτὸ κάλυμμα, then κάλυμμα in the contrast introduced by ἀλλά in ver. 15 would necessarily be *the same* veil, of which μὴ ἀνακαλύπτ. would be here said, and Paul must therefore at ver. 15 have written τὸ κάλυμμα with the article. Hence the *second* method of explanation¹ is to be preferred, according to which the participle is taken *absolutely*, and ὅτι as *that*, while καταργεῖται is referred to the παλ. διαθήκη, thus : *while it is not disclosed (unveiled),*² it remains hidden from the Jews, *that in Christ the old covenant is done away*, that in Christ—in His appearance and in His work—the abolition of the Old Covenant takes place (Rom. x. 4 ; Col. ii. 14). The whole is thus a more precise practical definition of the previous τὸ αὐτὸ κάλυμμα . . . μένει. This absolute appositional use of the *neuter participle* (to be regarded as *accusative*, though viewed by Hermann and others as *nominative*) is a current Greek idiom in impersonal phrases. See Hermann, *ad Viger.* p. 769 ; Bernhardt, p. 471 ; Krüger, § lvi. 9. 5 ; Maetzner, *ad Antiph.* p. 176. Hence Rückert is without reason in referring μὴ ἀνακαλύπτ. to τὸ κάλυμμα, and yet understanding ὅτι as *that* and καταργεῖται of the Old Covenant, whereby the unwarranted *importation* of a thought becomes necessary, namely, to this effect : “ the same veil rests on the reading of the O. T. and is not uplifted, so that it (the people) might perceive that it (the O. T.) has its end in Christ.” Luther’s translation (comp. Erasmus, Beza, and Heumann) follows the reading ὅτι (Elzevir), which Scholz also has again taken up. (H⁴) This ὅτι would have to be explained as *quippe quod* (velamen), and would give from the *nature* of the veil (Kühner, *ad Xen. Mem.* ii. 1. 30) the information why it remains unlifted,—an interpretation, however, which would only be compatible with the *first* view given above, and even with that would be unnecessary. —καταργεῖται] *present* ; for the fact, that in Christ the Old Covenant is abolished, is laid down in *theoretical* form as an *article of faith*, as a *truth* which remains veiled from the Jews so long as they are not converted to Christ (ver. 16).

Ver. 15. Ἀλλ’] opposite of the μὴ ἀνακαλ., ὅτι ἐν Χ. καταργ., but no longer connected with γάρ, ver. 14 (Hofmann), since the apostle does not again mean the particular veil (that of Moses) to which the confirmatory clause introduced with γάρ, ver. 14, referred. It is not disclosed, that, etc. ; *till to-day, on the contrary, there lies a veil*, etc. ; *till to-day, whenever* (ἂν, in whatsoever case) *Moses is publicly read, their insight* (comp. previously ἐπωρώθη, etc.) *is hindered and prevented*. The figurative expression does not again represent the *veil of Moses*, for otherwise τὸ κάλυμμα must necessarily (in opposition to Hof-

¹ So among the older commentators Castalio, and recently Kypke, Flatt, Osiander, Maier ; comp. also Krummel, who, however, mentally supplies “ *by all teachers of the law.*”

² Very naturally and suitably Paul chose the word ἀνακαλ., not ἀποκαλ. (in opposition to de Wette’s objection), since he has to do

with the conception of a κάλυμμα that remains. The veil remains, since it is not *unveiled* that, etc. In this way the explanatory expression is quite *in keeping with* the figure itself. Besides, ἀνακαλύπτειν was common enough in the sense of *to make manifest, to make known* (Tob. xii. 7, 11 ; Polyb. iv. 85. 6).

mann) have been used, but *generally a veil*, and that one placed over (ἐπί with acc.) the heart (here regarded as the centre of the practical intelligence, comp. iv. 6 ; Rom. i. 21 ; and see on Eph. i. 18 ; Krumm, *de not. psych. P.* p. 50 ; Delitzsch, *Psychol.* p. 248 f. ; Hahn, *Theol. d. N. T.* I. p. 460) of the hearers. (1⁴) The *impersonal* μὴ ἀνακαλυπτόμ. of ver. 14 induced the apostle very naturally and with logical suitableness, not to use again in the contrast of ver. 15, with its emphatic stress laid on the point ἕως σήμερον, that *historical* image of the veil of Moses, but to express the conception generally of a veil hindering perception (lying on the heart). The same thing, therefore, is expressed in two forms of one figure ; the first form gives the figure *historically* (the veil of Moses on the ἀνάγνωσις τ. παλ. διαθ.) ; the second form, apart from that historical reference, gives it as moulded by the apostle's own vivid imagination (a veil upon the heart at the public reading). Fritzsche (comp. Al. Morus in Wolf) assumes that Paul imagines to himself *two* veils, one on the public reading of the Old Covenant, the other on the hearers' own hearts, by which he wishes to mark the high degree of their inaptitude for perceiving. But, in order to be understood, and in keeping with a state of things so peculiar, he must have brought this out definitely and emphatically, and have at least written in ver. 15 : ' Ἀλλ' . . . Μωϋσῆς, καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν καρδίαν αὐτῶν κάλυμμα κεῖται. — ἡνίκα] at the hour when, quando, after Hom. *Od.* xxii. 198 frequent in the classic writers, but in the N. T. only here and at ver. 16. Often used in the Apocrypha and the LXX, also at Ex. xxxiv. 34 ; and perhaps the word was suggested by the recollection of this passage. — On ἀναγινώσκ. Μωϋσ. comp. Acts xv. 21.

Ver. 16. *When, however, it shall have turned to the Lord*, shall have come to believe on Christ, *the veil*, which lies on their heart (ver. 15), *is taken away* ; i.e., when Moses is read before them, it will no longer remain unperceived by them that the Old Covenant ceases in Christ. The *subject* to ἐπιστρέψῃ is ἡ καρδία αὐτῶν, ver. 15 (Luther in the gloss, Beza, Grotius, Bengel, and several others, including Billroth, Olshausen, de Wette, Hofmann), not ὁ Ἰσραήλ (Chrysostom, Theodoret, Theophylact, Pelagius, Erasmus, and many others, including Osiander), nor Μωϋσῆς (Calvin, Estius),¹ nor the general τίς (Origen, Storr, Flatt).—The common supposition, that in ver. 16 there is an allegorical reference to Moses, who, returning from the people to God, conversed unveiled with God (Ex. xxxiv. 34), is in itself probable from the context, and is confirmed even by the choice of the words (Ex. *l.c.* : ἡνίκα δ' αὖν εἰσεπορεύετο Μ. ἐναντι κυρίου . . . περιηρεῖτο τὸ κάλυμμα), though the same veil with which Moses was veiled (τὸ αὐτὸ κάλ., ver. 14) is no longer spoken of, but a veil on the hearts of the Jews.—ἡνίκα with αὖν and the subjunctive aorist² denotes : *then, when it shall have turned* (Luther wrongly : when it *turned* itself), and that as something conceived, thought

¹ Calvin thinks that *Moses* is here tantamount in meaning to the *law*, and that the sense is: When the law is referred to Christ, when Christ is sought in the law by the Jews, then will the truth dawn upon them. Estius, who refers κύριον to *God*,

says: "Moses conversus ad Dominum atque resectam habens faciem, typum gessit populi Christiani ad Deum conversi et revelata cordis facie salutis mysteria contemplantis."

² See Ellendt, *Lex. Soph.* I. p. 773.

of, not as an unconditioned fact. The *πρὸς κύριον*, however, does not affirm : *to God*, who is now revealed in the Lord (Hofmann), but, in simple accordance with *ἐν Χριστῷ* of ver. 15 : *to Christ*. The *conversion of Israel* which Paul has in view is, now that it is wholly relegated to the experience of the future, the *conversion as a whole*, Rom. xi. 25. It was, however, obvious of itself that what is affirmed finds its *application* to all individual cases which had already occurred and were still to be expected. — *περιαίρ.* has the emphasis, both of its important position at the head of the clause (*removed* is the veil) and of the future realized as present. The *passive* is all the more to be retained, seeing that the subject of *ἐπιστρ.* is the *heart*; the sense of *self-liberation* (Hofmann) may not be imported on account of Ex. xxxiv. 34. The conversion and deliverance of Israel is *God's* work. See ver. 17 and Rom. xi. 26 f. The *compound* corresponds to the conception of the veil *covering* the heart *round about*. Comp. Plato, *Polit.* p. 288 E : *δέρματα σωμάτων περιαιροῦσα*, Dem. 125, 26 : *περιεῖλε τὰ τείχη*, 802, 5 : *περιηρηται τοὺς στέφανους*, Judith x. 3 : *τὸν σάκκον*, Bar. iv. 34, vi. 58 ; Acts xxvii. 40.

Ver. 17. Remark giving information regarding what is asserted in ver. 16. — *δέ*, [the German] *aber*, appends not something of *contrast*, *i.e.* to Moses, who is the letter (Hofmann), but a clause elucidating what was just said, *περιαίρ. τὸ κάλ.*,¹ equivalent to *namely*. See Hermann, *ad. Viger.* p. 845 ; Hartung, *Partikell.* I. p. 167. Rückert (comp. de Wette) is of a different opinion, holding that there is here a *continued chain of reasoning*, so that Paul in vv. 16, 17 means to say : “When the people of Israel shall have turned to the Lord, then will the *κάλυμμα* be taken from it ; and when this shall have happened, it will also attain the freedom (from the yoke of the law) which is at present wanting to it.” But, because in that case the *ἐλευθερία* would be a more important point than the taking away of the veil, ver. 18 must have referred back not to the latter, but to the former. Seeing, however, that ver. 18 refers back to the taking away of the veil, it is clear that ver. 17 is only an accessory sentence, which is intended to remove every doubt regarding the *περιαίρεται τὸ κάλυμμα*.² Besides, if Rückert were right, Paul would have continued his discourse illogically ; the logical continuation would have been, ver. 17 : *οὐ δὲ περιαιρεῖται τὸ κάλυμμα, τὸ πνεῦμα κυρίου ἐστίν· οὐ δὲ τὸ πν. κυρ. κ.τ.λ.* — *ὁ δὲ κύριος τὸ πνεῦμα ἐστίν*] *ὁ κύριος* is *subject*, not (as Chrysostom, Theodoret, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Estius, Schulz held, partly in the interest of opposition to Arianism) *predicate*, which would be possible in itself, but cannot be from the connection with ver. 16.³ The

¹ Bengel aptly says : “*Particula autem ostendit, hoc versu declarari praecedentem. Conversio fit ad Dominum ut spiritum.*” Theodoret rightly furnishes the definition of the *δέ* as making the transition to an explanation by the intermediate question : *τίς δὲ οὗτος πρὸς ὃν δεῖ ἀποβλέψαι* ;

² There is implied, namely, in ver. 17 a syllogism, of which the *major premiss* is : *οὐ δὲ τὸ πνεῦμα κυρίου, ἐλευθερία*, “where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty ;”

the *minor premiss* is : “this Spirit he who is converted to the Lord has, because the Lord is the Spirit ;” the *conclusion* : “consequently that *κάλυμμα* can no longer have a place with the converted but only freedom.”

³ For the most complete, historical and critical conspectus of the many different interpretations of this passage, see Krummel, p. 58 ff.

words, however, cannot mean : *Dominus significat Spiritum* (Wetstein), because previously the conversion to Christ, to the actual personal Christ, was spoken of ; they can only mean : *the Lord, however, is the Spirit*, i.e. *the Lord, however, to whom the heart is converted* (note the article) *is not different from the (Holy) Spirit*, who is received, namely, in conversion, and (see what follows) is the divine life-power that makes free. That this was meant not of *hypostatical* identity, but according to the dynamical *oeconomic* point of view, that the fellowship of Christ, into which we enter through conversion, is the fellowship of the Holy Spirit, was obvious of itself to the believing consciousness of the readers, and is also put beyond doubt by the following τὸ πνεῦμα κυρίου. And Christ is the Spirit *in so far as at conversion, and generally in the whole arrangements of salvation, He communicates Himself in the Holy Spirit, and this Spirit is His Spirit, the living principle of the influence and indwelling of Christ*, —certainly the *living ground of life* in the church, and the *spirit of its life* (Hofmann), but as such just the *Holy Spirit*, in whom the Lord reveals Himself as present and savingly active. The same thought is contained in Rom. viii. 9–11, as is clear especially from vv. 10, 11, where Χριστός and τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ ἐγείραντος Ἰησοῦν and πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ (ver. 9) appear to be identical as the indwelling principle of the Christian being and life, so that there must necessarily lie at the bottom of it the idea : Χριστὸς τὸ πνεῦμα ἐστὶ. Comp. Gal. ii. 20, iv. 6, Phil. i. 19, Acts xx. 28, along with Eph. iv. 11. As respects His *immanence*, therefore, in His people, Christ is the Spirit. Comp. also Krummel, *l.c.* p. 97, who rightly remarks that, if Christ calls Himself the light, the way, the truth, etc., all this is included in the proposition : “the Lord is the Spirit.” Fritzsche, *Dissert.* I. p. 42, takes it : *Dominus est ita Sp. St. perfusus, ut totus quasi τὸ πνεῦμα sit.* So also Rückert, who nevertheless (following Erasmus and Beza) believes it necessary to explain the article before πνεῦμα by retrospective reference to vv. 6, 8.¹ But in that case the whole expression would be reduced to a mere *quasi*, with which the further inference οὗ δὲ τὸ πνεῦμα κυρίου would not be logically in accord ; besides, according to analogy of Scripture elsewhere, it cannot be said of the *exalted* Christ (and yet *it is He* that is meant), “*Spiritu sancto perfusus est*,” or “*Spiritu gaudet divino*,” an expression which can only belong to Christ in His earthly state (Luke i. 35 ; Mark i. 10 ; Acts i. 2, x. 38) ; whereas the glorified Christ is the sender of the Spirit, the possessor and disposer (comp. also Rev. iii. 1, iv. 5, v. 6), and therewith *Lord* of the Spirit, ver. 18. The weakened interpretation : “Christ, however, *imparts the Spirit*” (Piscator, L. Cappellus, Scultetus, and others, including Emmer-

¹ Quite erroneously, since no reader could hit on this retrospective reference, and also the following τὸ πνεῦμα κυρίου is said without any such reference. Paul, if he wished to express himself so as to be surely intelligible, *could not do otherwise than put the article* ; for, if he had written ὁ δὲ κύριος πνεῦμα ἐστὶ, he might have given rise to quite another understanding than he wished to express, namely : *the Lord is*

spirit, a spiritual being, as John iv. 24, πνεῦμα ὁ Θεός,—a possible misinterpretation, which is rejected already by Chrysostom. Comp. 1 Cor. xv. 45. We may add that τὸ πνεῦμα is to be explained simply according to hallowed usage of the Holy Spirit, not, as Lipsius (*Rechtfertigungsl.* p. 167) unreasonably presses the article, “the *whole full πνεῦμα*.” So also Ernesti, *Uspr. d. Sünde*, I. p. 229.

ling and Flatt), is at variance with the words, and is not to be supported by passages like John xiv. 6, since in these the predicates are not concretes but abstracts. In keeping with the view and the expression in the present passage are those Johannine passages in which Christ promises the communication of the Spirit to the disciples as His own return (John xiv. 18, *al.*). Others have departed from the simple sense of the words "Christ is the Spirit," *either* by importing into τὸ πνεῦμα another meaning than that of the Holy Spirit, *or* by not taking ὁ κύριος to signify the personal Christ. The *former* course is inadmissible, partly on account of the following οὐ δὲ τὸ πνεῦμα κυρίου, partly because the absolute τὸ πνεῦμα admits of no other meaning whatever than the habitual one; the *latter* is made impossible by ver. 16. Among those adhering to the *former* view are Morus: "Quum Dominum dico, intelligo illam divinitus datam religionis scientiam;" Erasmus and Calvin: "that τὸ πνεῦμα is the spirit of the law, which only becomes *viva et vivifica*, si a Christo inspiretur, whereby the spirit comes to the body;" also Olshausen: "the Lord now is just the Spirit, of which there was mention above" (ver. 6); by this is to be understood the spiritual institute, the economy of the Spirit; Christ, namely, fills His church with Himself; hence it is itself Christ. Comp. Ewald, according to whom Christ is designated, in contrast with the letter and compulsion of law, as the Spirit absolutely (just as God is, John iv. 24). Similarly Neander. To this class belongs also the interpretation of Baur, which, in spite of the article in τὸ πνεῦμα, amounts to this, that Christ in His substantial existence is *spirit*, i.e. *an immaterial substance composed of light*; ¹ comp. his *neut. Theol.* p. 187 f. See, on the contrary, Rübiger, *Christol. Paul.* p. 36 f; Krummel, *l.c.* p. 79 ff. Among the adherents of the *second* mode of interpretation are Vorstius, Mosheim, Bolten: "ὁ κύριος is the doctrine of Jesus;" also Billroth, who recognizes as its meaning: "in the kingdom of the Lord the Spirit rules; the essence of Christianity is the Spirit of the Lord, which He confers on His own." For many other erroneous interpretations (among which is included that of Estius, Calovius, and others, who refer ὁ κύριος to God, and so explain the words of the *divinity of the Holy Spirit*), see Pole and Wolf. — ἐλευθερία] *spiritual freedom in general*, without special limitation.² To have a veil on the heart (see ver. 15), and to be spiritually free, are *opposite*; hence the statement περιαιρεῖται τὸ κάλυμμα, ver. 16, obtains elucidation by our ἐλευθερία. The veil on the heart hinders the spiritual activity, and makes it fettered; where, therefore, there is *freedom*, the veil must be away; but freedom must have its seat, *where the Spirit of the Lord* is, which Spirit carries on and governs all the thinking and willing, and removes all barriers external to its sway. That Paul has regard (Erasmus, Beza, Grotius, Bengel, Fritzsche) to the conception that the veil is an outward sign of subjection (1 Cor. xi.

¹ Weiss also, *bibl. Theol.* p. 308, explains it to the effect, that Christ in His resurrection received a pneumatic body composed of light, and therefore became entirely πνεῦμα (1 Cor. xv. 45). But the article is against this also. Besides, the body of Christ in His resurrection was not yet the body of

light, which it is in heaven (Phil. iii. 21).

² Grotius understands it as *libertas a vitiis*; while Rückert, de Wette, and others, after Chrysostom, make it the freedom from the law of Moses. According to Erasmus, *Paraphr.*, it is *free virtue and love*.

10), is to be denied all the more, seeing that here what is spoken of is not a covering of the *head* (which would be the sign of a foreign ἐξουσία), as 1 Cor. l.c., but a veiling of the *heart*, ver. 15.

Ver. 18. The ἐλευθερία just mentioned is now further *confirmed* on an *appeal to experience* as in triumph, by setting forth the (free, unrestricted) relation of all *Christians* to the glory of *Christ*. The δέ is the simple μεταβατικόν, and forms the transition from the *thing* (ἐλευθερία) to the *persons*, in whom the thing presents itself in definite form. For the *freedom* of him who has the Spirit of the Lord forms the contents of ver. 18, and not simply the thought: "we, however, bear this Spirit of the Lord in us."¹ Flatt and Rückert are quite arbitrary in attaching it to ver. 14. — ἡμεῖς] refers to the *Christians in general*, as the connection, the added πάντες, and what is affirmed of ἡμεῖς, clearly prove. Erasmus, Cajetanus, Estius, Bengel, Michaelis, Nösselt, Stolz, Rosenmüller are wrong in thinking that it refers merely to the *apostles and teachers*. — The emphasis is not on πάντες (in which Theodoret, Theophylact, Bengel find a contrast to the *one* Moses), but on ἡμεῖς, in contrast to the Jews, "qui fidei carent oculis," Erasmus. — ἀνακεκαλ. προσώπῳ] *with unveiled countenance*; for through our conversion to Christ our formerly confined and fettered spiritual intuition (knowledge) became free and unconfined, ver. 16. After vv. 15, 16 we should expect ἀνακεκαλυμμένη καρδιά; but Paul changes the figure, because he wishes here to represent the persons not as *hearing* (as in ver. 15) but as *seeing*, and therewith his conception has manifestly returned to the history of Moses, who appeared before God with the veil removed, Ex. xxxiv. 34. Next to the subject ἡμεῖς, moreover, the emphasis lies on ἀνακεκαλ. προσώπῳ: "But we all, *with unveiled countenance* beholding the glory of the Lord in the mirror, become transformed to the same glory." For if the beholding of the glory presented in the mirror should take place *with covered face*, the reflection of this glory ("speculi autem est lumen repercutere," Emmerling) could not operate on the beholders to render them glorious, as, indeed, also in the case of Moses it was the *unveiled* countenance that received the radiation of the divine glory. — τὴν δόξαν κυρίου] said quite without limit of the whole *glory of the exalted Christ*.² It is the *divine*, in so far as Christ is the bearer and reflection of the divine glory (Col. i. 15, ii. 9; John xvii. 5; Heb. i. 3); but κυρίου does not (in opposition to Calvin and Estius) apply to *God*, on account of vv. 16, 17. — κατοπτριζόμενοι] *beholding in the mirror*. For we beheld the glory of Christ *in the mirror*, inasmuch as we see not immediately its objective reality, which will only be the case in the future

¹ So Rich. Schmidt, *Paulin. Christol.* p. 124 f.

² They see Him therefore as the σύνδρομος of the Father (Acts viii. 56), as the head of the church, as the possessor and bestower of the whole divine fulness of grace, as the future judge of the world, as the conqueror of all hostile powers, as the intercessor for His own, in short, as the wearer of the whole majesty which belongs to His

kingly office. Usually τ. δόξαν κυρ. is taken as including in its reference the state of *humiliation* (see especially Calovius, de Wette, Osiander), the moral elevation, the grace and truth (John i. 14), the lifting up on the cross, etc. This, however, is contrary to the parallel with the history of *Moses*, who saw the supernatural glory of God that might not otherwise be beheld. Grotius indicates the right view.

kingdom of God (John xvii. 24 ; 1 John iii. 2 ; Col. iii. 3 f. ; Rom. viii. 17 f.), but only *its representation in the gospel* ; for the gospel is τὸ εὐαγγ. τῆς δόξης τοῦ Χριστοῦ, iv. 4, consequently, as it were, the *mirror*, in which the glory of Christ gives itself to be seen and shines in its very image to the eye of faith ; hence the *believing heart* (Osiander), which is rather the *organ* of beholding, cannot be conceived as the mirror. Hunnius aptly remarks that Paul is saying, “nos non ad modum Judaeorum caecutire, sed relecta facie gloriam Domini in evangelii speculo relucentem intueri.” Comp. 1 Cor. xiii. 12, where likewise the gospel is conceived of as a mirror, as respects, however, the still imperfect vision which it brings about. κατοπτρίζω in the *active* means *to mirror*, i.e. *to show in the mirror* (Plut. Mor. p. 894 D) ; but in the *middle* it means among the Greeks *to look into, to behold oneself in a mirror*. To this head belong Athen. xv. p. 687 C, and all the passages in Wetstein, also Artemidorus, ii. 7, which passage is erroneously adduced by Wolf and others for the meaning : “*to see in the mirror*.” But this latter signification, which is that occurring in the passage now before us, is unquestionably found in Philo (Loesner, Obs. p. 304). See especially Alleg. p. 79 E : μηδὲ κατοπτρισαίμην ἐν ἄλλῳ τινὶ τὴν σὴν ἰδέαν ἢ ἐν σοὶ τῷ θεῷ. Pelagius (“contemplamur”), Grotius,¹ Rückert, and others quite give up the conception of a *mirror*, and retain *only* the notion of *beholding* ; but this is mere caprice, which quite overlooks as well the correct position of the case to which the word aptly corresponds, as also the reference which the following εἰκόνα has to the conception of the mirror. Chrysostom and his successors, Luther, Calovius, Bengel, and others, including Billroth and Olshausen, think that κατοπτρίζεσθαι means *to reflect, to beam back the lustre*, so that, in parallel with Moses, the glory of Christ is beaming ; ἡ καθαρὰ καρδία τῆς θείας δόξης οἶόν τι ἐκμαγεῖον καὶ κάτοπτρον γίνεται, Theodoret. (J⁴) Comp. Erasmus, Paraphr., and Luther’s gloss : “as the mirror catches an image, so our heart catches the knowledge of Christ.” But at variance with the usage of the language, for the *middle* never has this meaning ; and at variance with the context, for ἀνακεκαλ. προσώπῳ must, according to vv. 14–17, refer to the conception of free and unhindered *seeing*. — τὴν αὐτὴν εἰκόνα μεταμορφ.] *we become transformed to the same image, i.e. become so transformed that the same image which we see in the mirror—the image of the glory of Christ—presents itself on us, i.e. as regards the substantial meaning : we are so transformed that we become like to the glorified Christ*. Now, seeing that this transformation appears as caused by and contemporaneous with ἀνακεκ. προσ. τ. δόξ. κ. κατοπτρ., consequently not as a future sudden act (like the transfiguration at the Parousia, 1 Cor. xv. 51 f. ; comp. Phil. iii. 21), but as something at present in the course of development, it can only be the *spiritual transformation* to the very likeness of the glorified Christ¹ that is meant (comp. 2 Pet. i. 4 ; Gal. iv. 19, ii. 20), and not the

¹ “κατοπτρίζ., i.e. attente spectantes, quomodo et Latini dicunt speculari, nimirum quia qui speculum consulunt omnia singulatim intuentur. Sic Christiani attente meditantur, quanta sit Christi in coelis reg-

nantis gloria.”

² Comp. Calovius : “Illa autem μεταμόρφωσις neutiquam *essentialis* est, ut fanatici volunt, quum in substantiam Christi transformari nequeamus, sed *mystica et spir-*

future δόξα (Grotius, Fritzsche, Olshausen would have it *included*). Against this latter may be urged also the subsequent *καθάπερ ἀπὸ κυρίου πνεύματος*, which has its reference precisely to the *spiritual* transformation, that takes place in the present *αἰὼν*, and the *sequel* of which is the future Messianic glory to which we are called (1 Thess. ii. 12 ; Rom. viii. 30) ; so that the present spiritual process, the *καινότης ζωῆς* (Rom. vi. 4) and *πνεύματος* (Rom. vii. 6)—the spiritual being risen with and living with Christ (Rom. vi. 5 ff.)—experiences at the Parousia also the corresponding outward *συνδοξασθῆναι* with Christ, and is thus completed, Col. iii. 4. — *τὴν αὐτὴν εἰκόνα*] is not to be explained either by supplying *κατά* or *εἰς*, or by quoting the analogy of *παρακαλεῖσθαι παράκλησιν* and the like (Hofmann), but the construction of *μεταμορφοῦν* with the accusative is formed quite like the commonly occurring combination of *μεταβάλλειν* with the accusative in the sense : *to assume a shape through alteration or transmutation undergone*. See Stallbaum, *ad Plat. Rep.* p. 424 C. The passive turn given to it, in which the accusative remains unaltered (Krüger, § lii. 4. 6 ; Buttmann, *neut. Gr.* p. 164 [E. T. 190]), yields therefore the sense : *we are so transformed, that we get thereby the same image*. — *ἀπὸ δόξης εἰς δόξαν*] *i.e.* *so that this transformation issues from glory* (viz. from the glory of Christ beheld in the mirror and reflected on us), *and has glory as its result* (namely, *our* glory, see above). Comp. ii. 16, also Rom. i. 17. So in the main the Greek Fathers (yet referring *ἀπὸ δόξης*, according to their view of *ἀπὸ κυρίου πνεύματος*, to the glory of the *Holy Spirit*), Vatablus, Bengel, Fritzsche, Billroth, and others, also Hofmann. But most expositors (including Flatt, Rückert, Olshausen, de Wette, Osiander, Ewald) explain it of *ascending to ever higher* (and at length highest, 1 Cor. xv. 51 ff.) *glory*. Comp. *ἐκ δυνάμεως εἰς δύναμιν*, Ps. lxxxiv. 7, also Jer. ix. 2. In this way, however, the correlation of this *ἀπό* with the following (*ἀπὸ κυρ. πν.*) is neglected, although for *ἀπὸ . . . εἰς* expressions like *ἀπὸ θαλάσσης εἰς θάλασσαν* (Xen. *Hell.* i. 3 4) might be compared. — *καθάπερ ἀπὸ κυρίου πνεύματος*] *so as from the Lord of the Spirit*, people, namely, are transformed, *μεταμόρφωσις γίνεται*. In this there lies a confirmation of the asserted *τὴ αὐτὴν . . . δόξαν*. Erasmus rightly observes : “*ὥς hic non sonat similitudinem sed congruentiam.*” Comp. ii. 17 ; John i. 14, *al.* *Lord of the Spirit* (κ⁴) (the words are rightly so connected by “*neoterici quidam*” in Estius, Emmerling, Vater, Fritzsche, Billroth, Olshausen, de Wette, Ewald, Osiander, Kling, Krummel ; comp. however, also at an earlier date, Erasmus, *Annot.*) is Christ, in so far as the operation of the Holy Spirit depends on Christ ; for the Holy Spirit is the Spirit of Christ (ver. 17 ; Rom. viii. 9 f. ; Gal. iv. 6), in so far as Christ Himself rules through the Spirit in the hearts (Rom. viii. 10 ; Gal. ii. 20 ; Eph. iii. 16 f.) ; the sending of the Spirit,¹ is brought about through Christ (Tit. iii. 6),

Itualis . . . quum ejusdem et justitiae per fidem, et gloriae per gratiosam communicationem adeoque et divinae ejus naturae participes reddimur.”

¹ The *sender himself* is, according to Paul, not Christ, but *God*, 1 Cor. ii. 12, vi. 19 ; 2 Cor. i. 22 ; Gal. iv. 6 ; 1 Thess. iv. 8 ; Tit. iii.

6. According to John (xv. 26, xvi. 7), *Christ* also sends the Spirit, though not independently, but in the way of interceding with the Father (xiv. 16) ; comp. also Acts ii. 23. Hence there is no contradiction between Paul and John.

and by His operations *service is done to Christ* (1 Cor. xii. 5). Here, too, the *relation of subordination in the divine Trinity* is most distinctly expressed.¹ Why, however, is Christ here named *κύριος πνεύματος*? Because that spiritual metamorphosis, which proceeds from Christ, cannot take place otherwise than by the influence of the Holy Spirit on us. The explanations: *a Domini spiritu*² and *a Domino spiritu*, i.e. *a Domino qui est spiritus*³ agree, indeed, with the doctrine of the Trinity as formulated by the church, but deviate without reason or warrant from the normal order of the words (comp. ver. 17, and see Buttmann, *neut. Gramm.* p. 295 [E. T. 343]), in particular, from the genitive-relation which quite obviously suggests itself. Rückert hesitatingly allows a choice between the two erroneous views.

NOTES BY AMERICAN EDITOR.

(B⁴) “*Written in our hearts.*” Ver. 2.

“Anything of which a man is certain, or of which he has a conviction founded upon his inward experience, may be said to be written on his heart. That the Corinthians were his epistle was to the Apostle a matter of consciousness. It was a letter which he could neither misunderstand nor be ignorant of” (Hodge).

(C⁴) “*Such confidence.*” Ver. 4.

Not *trust*, as in the A. V., but confidence, and such as did not quail even under the eye of God. That it was as humble as it was strong, that it was in no sense self-confidence, is shown by the verses that follow.

(D⁴) “*A new covenant.*” Ver. 6.

The adjective here employed (*kainos*) has more than a temporal force like *neos*. The sense is, not an old and worn-out covenant, but one qualitatively different from all that had gone before, instinct with youth and energy; not a written word, but a living spirit.

The *letter* (the law) kills, (1) by demanding perfect obedience, which no man can render; (2) by producing the knowledge of sin and guilt, and so of just exposure to God’s wrath; (3) by exasperating the soul in holding forth to it the high standard of duty which it has no power or inclination to obey. The *Spirit* (the gospel), on the other hand, gives life, (1) by revealing a perfect and gratuitous righteousness; (2) by revealing God’s love and awakening hope in-

¹ The *qualitative* interpretation of the genitive, like *πατήρ οἰκτιρμ.*, i. 3 (de Wette, “whose whole character or whole efficacy is spirit”), is inadmissible, because *πνεῦμα*, in accordance with the context, must be the Holy Spirit as respects the notion of subsistence (the *person* of the Spirit).

² Syriac, Vulgate, Augustine, Theophylact, Pelagius, Erasmus, Castalio, Calvin, Grotius, Bengel, and others, including

Schrader and Hofmann.

³ Chrysostom: ὅρα πῶς καὶ ἐνταῦθα τὸ πνεῦμα κύριον καλεῖ Theodoret, Valla, Luther, Beza, Calovius, Wolf, Estius, and several others, including Flatt and Neander. Comp. also Rich. Schmidt, *Paul. Christol.* p. 125, according to whom *Christ* is here designated as *κύριος πνεῦμα*. But he is precisely *not* so designated, but as *κύριος πνεύματος*.

stead of fear ; (3) by transforming the soul through the Holy Ghost, so that it reflects the image of God.

(E⁴) "*Shall be with glory.*" Ver. 8.

Meyer's reference here to the Parousia is wholly uncalled for. The manifest comparison is between the outward brightness of the temporary old dispensation and the transcendent inward splendour of the new and lasting economy.

What was a bright cloud overhanging the cherubim to the light of God's presence filling the soul?"—The same remark may be made in reference to what the author says on ver. 12. There is nothing in the words themselves or the connection to lead one to think that the Apostle looks forward to the Parousia. On the contrary, the reference is to the present superiority of the gospel and its ministry to the law and the ministry of Moses.

(F⁴) *The reason of Moses's veil.* Ver. 13 (note).

It is not necessary to call Paul's statement of the reason of Moses's veiling his face a deviation from the account in Exodus. It is simply an addition, and there is no inconsistency in the two accounts. The veiling had both effects. It calmed the fears of the people, and it prevented their seeing how fleeting the brightness was.

(G⁴) *Rabbinic-allegorical exposition.* Ver. 13 (note).

There is no necessity of assuming that the Apostle was indebted for his language to any such method of interpretation. The words of Exodus xxxiv. 33 are incorrectly rendered in the Authorized Version by inserting *till*. The true version as given in the LXX. is, "And when he had made an end of speaking with them, he put a veil on his face." The face of Moses was unveiled when he came fresh from the presence of Jehovah, and veiled only after he had delivered God's commands and the people had seen the glory. Paul declares that one object of this was that the people might not see the end (termination), the fading away, of this glory. Who has any right to say that this was not actually the fact? As Prof. C. A. Briggs says (*Presb. Review*, i. 566), "The face of Moses needed a new illumination from the Theophany every time he addressed the people from Jehovah. But the face of Christ needed no new illumination—the glory abode therein forever. The face of Moses was veiled that he might not be humiliated and the people might not be discouraged or rendered irreverent by seeing the glory gradually becoming fainter and fainter till it disappeared."

(H⁴) "*That it is done away in Christ.*" Ver. 14.

Tischendorf and Westcott and Hort read *ὅτι*, which Kling, Hodge, and Waite render *because* ; but Conybeare, Alford, Stanley, Beet, Plumptre, and Principal Brown, *that*, viz. "it not being revealed that," etc., as Meyer and the margin of the Revised Version. As a veil covered Moses's face, hiding from Israel the fact that its glory was fading, so the open page of the Old Covenant, even while being read, was veiled, since it was not yet made known to the consciousness of these readers that that covenant (not of course as a rule of life, for in

that sense it is established by the Gospel, Matt. v. 17, but as a basis of approach to God and acceptance with Him) is done away. In other words, the book was veiled.

(I⁴) “*A veil lieth upon their heart.*” Ver. 15.

The metaphor is changed while the word is kept, in order to show that the real hindrance is not in the book, but in the hearts of the readers.

(J⁴) “*Reflecting as a mirror.*” Ver. 18.

This sense is adopted in the text of the Revised Version, but in the margin (which is preferred by the American Committee) the better rendering of A. V., Kling, Hodge, Waite, Beet, and Plumptre is given—*beholding as in a mirror*. Stanley’s argument to the contrary, though able, is not convincing.

(K⁴) “*The Lord of the Spirit.*” Ver. 18.

This rendering, although linguistically possible, is incongruous with New Testament usage, and therefore not to be adopted without necessity. Whereas, to translate “the Lord (who is) the Spirit” (Kling, Stanley, Brown, Plumptre) gives the usual sense of two nouns thus placed (Rom. i. 7; Gal. i. 1, 3, etc.), and is in strict consistency with the immediate context. See ver. 17. There the Apostle had said, “The Lord is the Spirit,” and here, he says, the transforming power by which we are made like Christ flows from “the Lord who is the Spirit.” Hodge explains the phrase as meaning the Lord who is one with the Spirit, the same in substance, equal in power and glory; who is where the Spirit is, and does what the Spirit does.

CHAPTER IV.

Ver. 4. ἀγάσαι] A, 10, 17, 23, 31, and several Fathers have διαυγάσαι ; C D E, 73, Or. (once) Eus. *al.* have καταυγάσαι. So Lachm. on the margin. Two more precise definitions to accord with the context. The αὐτοῖς that follows (in Elz.) has decisive evidence against it, and is an addition. — Ver. 6. λάμπαι] Lachm. reads λάμπει, following A B D* S* 67** Aeth. But the evidence of almost all the Versions and all the Fathers is against it ; and how easily λάμπει might occur to the copyists through remembrance of the direct address in Gen. i. 3 ! — The omission of the following ὅς (D* F G 36, It. Chrys. and several Fathers), as well as the weakly-supported readings ὡς, οὗτος, and *ipse*, are corrections arising from not understanding the sense. — τοῦ θεοῦ] Lachm. reads αὐτοῦ, on no preponderating evidence. A change for the sake of the style ; for if it had been αὐτοῦ originally, there would have been no uncertainty whatever about the reference, and so no reason for glossing it by τοῦ θεοῦ. — Ἰησοῦ] is to be deleted, according to A B 17, Or. (once) *al.*, with Lachm. Tisch. and Rück. — Ver. 10. τοῦ Ἰησοῦ] Elz. has τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ, against decisive testimony. — Ver. 12. ὁ θάν.] Elz. has ὁ μὲν θάν., against decisive testimony. — Ver. 14. διὰ Ἰησοῦ] Lachm. Tisch. Rück. and also Reiche (*Comm. crit.* I. p. 351 f.) have σὺν Ἰησοῦ, following B C D E F G S* 6, 17, 31, Copt. Slav. Vulg. It. Tert. Ambros. Pel. Rightly ; the σὺν Ἰησοῦ appeared unsuitable in point of time to the resurrection of the dead. — Ver. 16: ὁ ἔσωθεν] Lachm. and Rück. read ὁ ἔσω ἡμῶν, following preponderating evidence, indeed ; but it is evidently a change in accordance with what goes before. — Ver. 17. After παραντίκα, D* E F G 31, Syr. Arr. Arm. Vulg. It. and Latin Fathers have πρόσκαιρον καί. A gloss, which has crept in, of παραντίκα. Comp. Theodoret : διὰ τοῦ παραντίκα ἔδειξε τὸ βραχύ τε καὶ πρόσκαιρον.

REMARK.—In the Codex Alexandrinus all from iv. 13, ἐπίστευσα, xxii. 6 inclusive, is wanting through mutilation.

CONTENTS.—Continuation of the theme begun in iii. 12 f. (vv. 1–6) ; relation of the external state, so full of suffering, to the glory of the office (vv. 7–18).

Ver. 1. Διὰ τοῦτο] Paul now reverts, it is true, to what had been begun in iii. 12 f., but had, owing to the comparison with Moses and the discussion thence arising about the hardening of the Jews and the freedom contrasted with it (iii. 14–18), remained without further elucidation, but reverts in such a way that he attaches it to what immediately precedes by διὰ τοῦτο. Therefore, since the Christians are so highly privileged as was specified in iii. 17, 18, *we become, in the possession of the office, which ministers to this Christian freedom and glorification. . . not dejected.*—καθὼς ἡλέθη.] a modal definition, full of humility (comp. 1 Cor. xv. 10, vii. 25), to ἔχοντες τ. διακ. ταύτ. : “*having this ministry in accordance with the (divine) mercy imparted*

to us." The important practical bearing of this addition is aptly indicated by Bengel : "Misericordia Dei, per quam ministerium accipitur, facit strenuos et sinceros." — οὐκ ἐκκακοῦμεν] Lachmann, Tischendorf, [Westcott and Hort], and Rückert, following A B D* F G 8, read ἐγκακοῦμεν (comp. ver. 16 ; Luke xviii. 1 ; Gal. vi. 9 ; Eph. iii. 13 ; 2 Thess. iii. 13). But this appears to be a correction, since only ἐγκακεῖν, and not ἐκκακεῖν (which is here the reading of C D*** E K L), occurs for certain out of the N. T. and the Fathers and ancient lexicographers. Polyb. iv. 19. 10 ; Theodotion, Prov. iii. 11, Symmachus, Gen. xxvii. 46 ; Num. xxi. 5 ; Isa. vii. 16. Comp. ἐγκάκησις, Symmachus, Ps. cxix. 143. Probably ἐκκακεῖν was at that time only in oral use, and came first through Paul and Luke into the language of ecclesiastical writings. It means, however, *to become cowardly, to lose courage*. Hesychius, ἡδημόνησεν· ἐξεκάκησεν ; Suidas, ἐξεκάκησα· ἀπηγόρευσα. The contrast in ver. 2 is not adverse to this signification ; for the becoming dejected through any kind of difficulties (with Pelagius, Theodoret, Oecumenius, Beza, and others, to think only of *sufferings* is arbitrary) leads easily to κρυπτὰ τῆς αἰσχύνης, while bold, brave, unweakened courage disdains such things. Comp. the demeanour of Luther. Hence Rückert is mistaken in holding that, for the sake of the contrast, we must assume the general signification : *to abandon oneself to badness*, a signification which cannot elsewhere be made good for ἐγκακ. or for ἐκκακ. (in Polybius, iv. 19. 10, ἐνεκάκησαν means, "they were lazy"). Chrysostom is in substance correct : οὐ καταπίπτομεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ χαίρομεν καὶ παρρησιαζόμεθα. The opposite is the preservation of the holy ἀνδρία (1 Cor. xvi. 13).

Ver. 2. Contrast to οὐκ ἐκκακοῦμεν in reference to antagonistic teachers. — ἀπειπάμεθα] *we have renounced, we have put away from us*. Comp. Homer, *Il.* xix. 35, 75 ; Plato, *Legg.* xi. p. 928 D ; Polyb. xiv. 9. 6 ; and in the middle, in this sense, Herod. i. 205, iv. 120, vii. 14 ; often in Polyb. ; also Callim. *Hymn. in Dian.* 174 : ἀπὸ δ' εἶπατο τέθμια Ταύρων, Aelian, *H. N.* vi. 1 : τὴν ἀκόλαστον κοίτην ἀπείπατο παντελῶς πᾶσαν. Regarding the aorist middle, ἀπειπάμην, see Thomas M. p. 57 ; Moeris, p. 29 ; Kühner, I. p. 817, ed. 2. — τὰ κρυπτὰ τῆς αἰσχύνης] as in 1 Cor. iv. 5, τὰ κρ. τοῦ σκότους, *the hidden things of shame*, i.e. *what shame* (the sense of honour, *verecundia*) *hides*,¹ does not allow to come to the light. This is to be left quite general : "All that one, because he is ashamed of it, does not permit to become manifest," but, on the contrary, κρυφῇ καλύπτει καρδίᾳ (Soph. *Antig.* 1239) ; ἃ κρύπτειν δεῖ καὶ συσκιάζειν αἰσχυνομένους καὶ ἐρυθριῶντας, Chrysostom. All special limitations, such as to *secret plans and intrigues* (Beza, Grotius, and others, including Emmerling and Billroth), or to the *disfiguring* (Calvin) or *hiding* (de Wette) of the truth, or to *secret fear of men* (Ewald), or to hidden, disgraceful *arts of fleshly wisdom* (Neander), or to secret means and ways to which the preacher of Chris-

¹ αἰσχύνῃ in the *subjective* sense (Plato, *Def.* p. 416 : φόβος ἐπὶ προσδοκίᾳ ἀδοξίας). See, especially, *Ecclus.* iv. 21, xx. 20 f., xli. 16. Comp. *Dem.* 43, 6 : τοῖς ἐλευθέροις μεγίστην ἀνάγκην εἶναι τὴν ὑπὲρ τῶν πραγμάτων αἰσχύνῃν. The *objective* interpretation, *disgrace*, Phil.

iii. 19 ("which brings disgrace," de Wette ; Osiander, "shameful secrecy"), would make it necessary to import the thought : "if it becomes manifest." Zeger : "quae manifestata probro sunt perpetranti."

tianity, who is ashamed of Christianity, has recourse (Hofmann), or even to *circumcision* (Theodoret), or to *promises not made good* (Chrysostom), or to a *hypocritical habit* (Theophylact), or even to *obscenous voluptates* (Estius, Krebs), are without warrant ; for Paul proceeds from the general to the particular, so that it is only in what follows, when referring more pointedly to his opponents, that he adduces particular forms of the κρυπτὰ τῆς αἰσχύνης. — μὴ περιπ. κ.τ.λ.] *so that we walk not*, etc. The apostle means his demeanour *in the ministry*. — δολοῦντες τ. λόγον τ. θεοῦ] *adulterating the word of God*. Lucian, *Herm.* 59 ; LXX. Ps. xv. 3. It is done by alterations and foreign admixtures. Comp. ii. 17, i. 12. — τῇ φανερώσει τῆς ἀληθ.] *through the manifestation of the truth* (comp. 1 Cor. xii. 7), *i.e.* by making the truth contained in the gospel (the truth κατ' ἐξοχήν) public, or, in other words, a clearly presented object of knowledge. The contrast gives a special occasion here for designating the contents of the gospel by ἡ ἀλήθεια. On the subject-matter, comp. Rom. i. 16. — συνιστῶντες ἑαυτούς] The *emphasis* of the contrast lay in τῇ φανερ. τ. ἀλ. ; *but, on the contrary*, through nothing else than *through the proclamation of the truth commending ourselves*. But even in this “commending ourselves” there clearly lies a contrasting reference to the antagonistic teachers, who accused the apostle of self-praise (iii. 1), but on their part not merely by letters of recommendation, but even by intrigues (ἐν πανουργίᾳ, xi. 3, xii. 16 ; Eph. iv. 14 ; Luke xx. 23) and by adulteration of the gospel (δολοῦντες τὸν λόγ. τ. θεοῦ) sought to make themselves honoured and beloved among others. Comp. 1 Thess. ii. 3, 4. Overlooking this, Rückert recommends for συνιστ. the general meaning of *laying down, setting forth, proving* (Rom. v. 8). — πρὸς πᾶσαν συνείδ. ἀνθρώπ.] *πρὸς* used of the ethical direction. The essential meaning is, indeed, not different from πρὸς τὴν συνείδησιν πάντων τῶν ἀνθρώπων (for which it is often taken, even by Rückert), but it is otherwise conceived, namely : “*to every human conscience.*” Comp. Rom. ii. 9. Note how Paul here ascribes to *every* man the capacity of moral judgment, and thus also the knowledge of the moral law as the *propositio major* of the inference of conscience. If now, however, refractory minds, through perverted moral judgment or moral stubbornness, were unwilling to recognize this *de facto* self-recommendation made uniformly and without προσωποληψία, the matter remained the same on the part of the apostle ; hence it is not, with Grotius, to be explained only of the “*bonae conscientiae*,” against the meaning of the words. — ἐνώπ. τοῦ θεοῦ] applies to συνιστῶντες . . . ἀνθρώπων ; *so that this our self-recommendation is made in God's presence*. This denotes the highest *sincerity* and honesty in the subjectivity of the person acting, who knows that God (τὸν τοῦ συνειδότος ἐπόπτην, Theodoret) is present as eye-witness. Comp. ii. 17, vii. 12 ; Gal. i. 20.

Ver. 3. Against the assertion just made, ἀλλὰ τῇ φανερώσει τῆς ἀληθείας . . . θεοῦ, it might be objected : “and yet your gospel is κεκαλυμμένον ! is by so many not at all known as the ἀλήθεια !” Wherefore Paul continues, “even if that were the case, still it is so only with regard to the ἀπολλύμενοι whom the devil has blinded, and hence cannot be urged against the former assertion.” — εἰ δὲ καὶ ἔστι κεκαλ.] In this admission the placing of ἔστι before κεκαλ. conveys the meaning : *but if even it is the case that*, etc. The figura-

tive κεκαλ. was suggested by the still fresh remembrance of iii. 14. — τὸ εὐαγγ. ἡμῶν] *the gospel preached by us, the Pauline gospel.* — ἐν τοῖς ἀπολλυμ.] *i.e.* among those who (for certain) incur the eternal ἀπώλεια. See on ii. 15 ; 1 Cor. i. 18. ἐν is not *nota dativi* (Flatt), nor yet *quod attinet ad* (Bengel), but *inter, in their circle.* Rückert takes it : *in their hearts*, on account of iii. 15. So also Osiander. But against the analogy of ii. 15 ; besides, according to iii. 15, it is the heart of the ἀπολλύμενοι, and not the gospel, which must be represented as the veiled subject. It has not at all reached the *hearts* of the persons concerned. (L⁴)

Ver. 4. A statement to establish the ἐν τοῖς ἀπολλυμ. ἐστὶ κεκαλ., so that ἐν οἷς is equivalent to ὅτι ἐν τούτοις (comp. on iii. 6) : *in whom the devil has made blind, i.e.* incapable of the perception of the truth, *the thoughts of the unbelieving* (νοήματα, as in iii. 14).¹ It is his work to make the unbelieving blind, as respects the bringing forward their power of thought to confront the light of the gospel ; and this his characteristic ἔργον he has carried out in the ἀπολλύμενοι ; in their souls he has succeeded in his devilish work of blinding the thoughts of the unbelieving. Observe, accordingly, that the conception of the ἀπολλύμενοι is a narrower one than that of the ἄπιστοι. Not with all ἄπιστοι does the devil gain in presence of the preaching of the gospel his object of blinding them and making them ἀπολλύμενοι ; many so comport themselves towards this preaching that they become believing and σωζόμενοι (1 Cor. xiv. 24 f. ; Acts xiii. 48, ii. 40, 47 ; Matt. xiii. 8, 23). (M⁴) Hence τῶν ἀπίστων is neither aimless (the objection of Hofmann), nor is it, with Rückert, to be referred to a *negligence* of expression, so that Paul would, in order to round off the sentence and to make his opinion quite clearly prominent, that the ἀπολλύμενοι are the ἄπιστοι, have appended the appositional clause ungrammatically and tautologically. Fritzsche, whom Billroth follows, takes τῶν ἀπίστ. *proleptically* : “*hoc effectu ut nullam haberent fidem.*” But the proleptic use of adjectives (see on 1 Cor. i. 8) is nowhere found with the genitive of an adjective used substantively ; it must have run ἐτύφλωσε τὰ νοήματα ἄπισπα.² Comp. 1 Thess. iii. 13 ; Phil. iii. 21. Quite arbitrarily, most of the older expositors (also Grotius, Wolf, Emmerling, Flatt) explain it in such a way that τῶν ἀπίστων fills the place of an apposition to ἐν οἷς. In that case it must have run : ἐν τοῖς ἀπίστοις (see, especially, Bornemann, *Schol. in Luc.* p. 173). According to Ewald, Paul has inserted the addition τῶν ἀπίστ., as if he meant thereby merely to say : “*the Gentile thoughts,*” because the Jews regarded the Gentiles only as the unbelievers. But such a reference would have needed all the more a precise indication, as the reader had to find in τοῖς ἀπολλυμ. *Gentiles and Jews*, consequently in τῶν ἀπίστ. no special reference to the *Gentile* character. According to Hofmann, ἐν οἷς is intended to be the *domain* within which, etc., and this do-

¹ Comp. Homer, *Od.* xx. 346 : μνηστῆρσι δὲ Παλλὰς Ἀθήνη . . . παρέπλαγξε νόημα, Pind. *Ol.* vii. 133, xii. 13 ; Plat. *Phaed.* p. 96 C ; Lucian, *Nigr.* 4.

² According to Fritzsche, the unbelief appears as *effect* of the blinding, consequently as a *refusal* of belief, as ἀπείθεια. In our

view, it appears as *defectus fidei* and the devil *steps in* with his blinding, and *makes* out of the ἄπιστοι the υἱοὺς τῆς ἀπειθείας (Eph. v. 6 ; Col. iii. 6). As regards the contents of the thought, therefore, the two views are not contradictory.

main is in view of the preaching of the apostle the *Gentile* one, in which there has taken place that which this relative clause asserts of the unbelieving. To this the context is opposed, which gives no justification whatever for limiting the ἀπολλύμενοι to the sphere of the *Gentile world*; they form, in general, a contrast to the σωζόμενοι, as also at ii. 15, i. 18, and to the ἡμεῖς πάντες, iii. 18, who are just the σωζόμενοι. Finally, it is to be observed as a mere historical point, that Irenaeus (*Haer.* iv. 48), Origen, Tertullian (*contra Marc.* iv. 11), Chrysostom, Augustine (*c. advers. leg.* ii. 7. 8), Oecumenius, Theodoret, Theophylact (also Knatchbull), with a view to oppose the dualism of the Marcionites and Manichaeans, joined τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου with τῶν ἀπίστων (*infidelium hujus saeculi*). — ὁ θεὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου.] *the God of this* (running on till the Parousia) *period*. On the subject-matter, comp. John viii. 44, xii. 31, xiv. 30; Eph. ii. 2, vi. 12; 2 Thess. ii. 9 f. The devil, as ruling principle, is called *god*. Comp. Phil. iii. 19. Among the Rabbins, also, it is said: “Deus primus est Deus verus, sed Deus secundus est Samael,” Jalkut Rubeni, f. 10. 4, *ad Gen.* i. 27. Comp. the passages in Eisenmenger, *Entdeckt. Judenth.* I. p. 827, where he is called the *strange god* and the *other god*. There is not something ironical in the expression here (Olshausen), for that would be quite alien to the connection; on the contrary, with the utmost earnestness the great anti-Christian power of the devil is intended to be made palpably evident. Comp. Bengel. (N¹) — εἰς τὸ μὴ ἀνγάζειν κ.τ.λ.] Purpose of the devil: *in order that the illumination should not shine*, etc. For that which illumines does not shine for the blinded.¹ Hence it is quite unnecessary to explain ἀνγάζειν, *to see*, or *to have an eye upon* (Luther, Grotius, Emmerling, Rückert, Ewald, Hofmann), which signification (more exactly, *to direct the light of the eyes to anything*) undoubtedly occurs in Greek poets (Soph. *Phil.* 217; Eur. *Rhes.* 793; more frequently in the middle, as *Iliad*, xxii. 458; Elmsley, *ad Bacch.* 596; Jacobs, *ad Anthol.* VIII. p. 338), but is foreign even to the LXX. (Lev. xiii. 25 f., 28, 39, xiv. 56). Besides, the simple ἀνγάζειν does not occur in the classic writers with the neuter meaning *fulgere* (though the compounds κατανγάζειν and διανγάζειν, which are the readings of several uncials, do so occur), but only in the active sense: *irradiate, illumine*, as e.g. Eur. *Hec.* 637. — φωτισμός] *illumining*, is found in Sextus Empiricus, 522. 9; Plut. *Mor.* 920 D; more often in the LXX., in Aquila, Theodotion, and Symmachus. Without figure, the meaning is: *in order that the enlightening truth of the gospel might not be known and appropriated by them*. — τῆς δόξης τοῦ Χριστοῦ] *The glory of the exalted Christ* (comp. iii. 18) is here denoted as the contents of the Messianic preaching; elsewhere (1 Cor. i. 18) it is the word of the cross. Both meanings are used according to the requirement of the context, and both rightly (Rom. iv. 25, v. 10, *al.*); for the δόξα is the consequence of the death of the cross, by which it was conditioned (Phil. ii. 6 ff.; Rom. viii. 34, *al.*; Luke xxiv. 26; often in John), and it conditions the future completion of the work of the cross (Phil. ii. 10 f.; Rom. viii. 34; Heb. vii. 25; 1 Cor. xv.; Col. iii. 3 f.). — ὅς ἐστιν εἰκὼν τ. θεοῦ] for Christ in the state

¹ Hofmann very wrongly, since he himself recognizes the lofty poetic turn of the

words, objects that this explanation would require the (not genuine) αὐτοῖς.

of His exaltation¹ is again, as He was before His incarnation (comp. John xvii. 5), fully ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ and ἴσα θεῷ (Phil. ii. 6), hence in His glorified corporeality (Phil. iii. 21) the visible image of the invisible God. See on Col. i. 15; comp. Heb. i. 3. It is true that in the state of His humiliation He had likewise the divine δόξα, which He possessed κατὰ πνεῦμα ἀγιωσύνης (Rom. i. 4), which also, as bearer of the divine grace and truth (John i. 14), and through His miracles (John ii. 11), He made known (John xiv. 9); but its working and revelation were limited by His humiliation to man's estate, and He had divested Himself of the divine appearance (Phil. ii. 7 f.) till in the end, furnished through His resurrection with the mighty attestation of His divine sonship (Rom. i. 4), He entered, through His elevation to the right hand of God, into the full communion of the glory of the Father, in which he is now the God-man, the very image and reflection of God, and will one day come to execute judgment and to establish the kingdom.—Aim of the addition: “hinc satis intelligi potest, *quanta* sit gloria Christi,” Bengel; it is the *highest* and *holiest of all*, and of the knowledge of *it* Satan deprives those whom he blinds!

Ver. 5. What *his* gospel (τὸ εὐαγγ. ἡμῶν) proclaimed, he has just described as that which is most glorious and sublime, namely, the δόξα τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὅς ἐστιν κ.τ.λ. And that nothing else than this is the lofty contents of his preaching, he now *establishes*, and that under an antithetic point of view, which (comp. iii. 1) takes into account hostile calumny. This antithetic aim so fully justifies the reference of the γάρ to what immediately precedes, and the emphasis laid on Χριστ. Ἰησ. as κύριον, as well as the contents of ver. 6, so obviously confirms it, that we have no warrant for going back with γάρ to iii. 1, even if we include vv. 3–5 (Hofmann). — ἐαυτοὺς κηρύσσει.] In virtue of the contrast that follows (Kühner, *ad Xen. Anab.* iv. 8. 25), κυρίους might be supplied (de Wette and others, also my own view hitherto), and with this i. 24 might be compared. But since it was self-evident that he did not *preach* himself as Lord, and this could not be attributed to him even by his opponents, however much they may have accused him of selfish conduct, it is better (comp. Hofmann) to let the expression retain its quite general character: *not ourselves*, not our own persons, their insight, standing, repute, and other interests, *do we make the contents and aim of our preaching*. — κύριον] *as Lord*. In this lies the whole great confessional contents of his preaching, which absolutely excludes all desire for self-assertion; comp. Phil. ii. 11; 1 Cor. xii. 3. This κύριον also is to be left quite in its generality,² so that the following ὑμῶν has no joint reference to it (Hofmann). — διὰ Ἰησοῦν] This it is by which the relation of service to the readers (δοῦλους ὑμῶν) is conditioned. For *on His account*, not irrespectively of Him, we are your servants. Comp. 1 Cor. iv. 1. To do the will of Jesus, and to carry on His work—this it is which determines us to be your *servants*, *i.e.* to do our labour for your *service*; only in this respect, in this relation of

¹ For it is the *Exalted One* of whom Paul is thinking. Comp. Ernesti, *Urspr. d. Sünde*, p. 212 f.

² The *whole majesty* of Christ (ver. 4) lies in this *one* predicate.

service to you, do we preach *ourselves*, which, therefore, is something quite different from the *ἐαυτ. κηρυσσ.* before denied.

Ver. 6. Confirmation of the above, and not simply of the concluding words of ver. 5 (*ἐαυτοὺς δὲ δούλους κ.τ.λ.*), but of the entire ver. 5. For it is *God* who has bestowed on us *such* enlightenment, and for *such* behoof as is declared in ver. 6 ; how should we not be far exalted above the preaching of *ourselves* instead of *Christ* as the Lord, and how could we proclaim ourselves otherwise than simply *in the relation of serviceableness to you*, serviceableness for *Christ's* sake !—"For God, who bade light shine out of darkness, it is who caused it to shine in our hearts, in order that we should make the knowledge of the divine glory give light in the presence of Christ." Apart from this figurative clothing, the sense is : *For it is God, the creator of light, who bestowed on us the spiritual light communicated to us, not that we might retain it for ourselves without further communication, but that we should convey the knowledge of the divine glory to others in making this knowledge manifest to them in Christ, whom we teach them to know.* As to the construction, *ὅς* is not to be taken as equivalent to *οὗτος* (Vorstius, Mosheim, Morus, Rosenmüller, Schrader ; comp. Theodoret and Luther), nor is *ὅς* to be deleted (Rückert hesitates between the two), but *ἐστὶ* is to be supplied, and supplied before *ὅς ἐλάμψεν* (so, rightly, most of the commentators ¹), not immediately after *ὁ θεός* (Valla, Erasmus, Vatablus, Estius, Bengel, Vater, Ewald), because it is only with *ὅς ἐλάμψεν* that the important idea is introduced, and because Paul has written *ὅς* and not *ὅς καί*. On account of the *ὅς κ.τ.λ.* that follows it is impossible, with Hofmann, to regard the sentence *ὅτι ὁ θεός* as far as *λάμψαι* ("for it is God who . . . has bidden to shine") as a complete and perfect sentence. — *ὁ εἰπὼν ἐκ σκότους φῶς λάμψαι*] *qui jussit*, etc. Reminiscence of Gen. i. 3,² in order to prepare for the following *ὅς ἐλάμψεν κ.τ.λ.*, which is meant to appear as analogous to the *physical* working of God in the creation. "Saepe comparantur beneficia creationis veteris et novae," Grotius. The emergence of the light of the holy truth in Christ from amid the sinful darkness of untruth (Hofmann) is not as yet spoken of ; this spiritual fact only finds its expression in what follows, and has here merely the way prepared for it by the corresponding physical creation of light. — *ἐκ* may doubtless mean *immediately after* (Emmerling), see Heindorf, *ad Prot.* p. 463 ; Jacobs, *ad Ael.* p. 464 ; but in the N. T. it does not so occur, and here "*forth out of darkness*" is far more in keeping with graphic vividness, for such is the position of the matter when what is dark becomes lighted up ; comp. LXX. Job xxxvii. 15. — *ὅς ἐλάμψεν ἐν τ. καρδ. ἡμ.*] This *ὅς* cannot be referred to *Christ*, with Hofmann, who compares irrelevantly Heb. v. 7 (where Christ is in fact the chief subject of what immediately precedes), but it applies to *God*. Whether *ἐλάμψεν* is *intransitive* (Chrysostom and most expositors) : *he shone*, which would have to be explained from the idea of the indwelling of God by means of the Holy Spirit (John xiv. 23 ; 1 Cor. iii. 16, xiv. 25), or

¹ Comp. also Buttmann, *neutest. Gramm.* p. 338 [E. T. 395].

² Ewald, following the reading *λάμψει*,

supposes an allusion to Isa. lx. 1, Job xii. 22, or to some lost passage.

whether it is *factitive*: *who made it* (namely, $\phi\acute{o}\varsigma$) *shine* (Grotius, Bengel, Emmerling, Fritzsche), as $\alpha\nu\alpha\tau\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\lambda\epsilon\iota\nu$ is used in Matt. v. 45, and even $\lambda\acute{\alpha}\mu\pi\epsilon\iota\nu$ in the poets (Eur. *Phoen.* 226, and the passages in Matthiae, p. 944; Jacobs, *ad Anthol.* VI. p. 58, VII. p. 378, VIII. p. 199; *ad Del. Epigr.* p. 62; Lobeck, *ad Adj.* p. 94, ed. 2), is decided from the context by the preceding physical analogy, which makes the *factitive* sense in keeping with the $\epsilon\iota\pi\acute{\omega}\nu \lambda\acute{\alpha}\mu\pi\alpha\iota$ most probable. If the progress of thought had been: “*who himself shone*” (Chrysostom, Theodoret), the text must have run, $\delta\varsigma \alpha\iota\tau\acute{o}\varsigma \acute{\epsilon}\lambda\alpha\mu\psi\epsilon\nu$. God has wrought in the hearts of the apostolic teachers, spiritually creating light, just as physically as at the creation He called light out of the darkness. Hofmann, in consequence of his referring $\delta\varsigma$ to Christ, wrongly explains it: “*within* them has been repeated that which took place in the word *when Christ appeared in it.*” On the point itself in reference to *Paul*, see Gal. i. 16. — $\pi\rho\delta\varsigma \phi\omega\tau\iota\sigma\mu\acute{o}\nu \kappa.\tau.\lambda.$] *for the purpose of lighting* (ver. 4), etc., equivalent to $\pi\rho\delta\varsigma \tau\acute{o} \phi\omega\tau\acute{\iota}\zeta\epsilon\iota\nu \tau\eta\nu \gamma\nu\acute{\omega}\sigma\iota\nu \kappa.\tau.\lambda.$, *in order that there may lighten*, etc., by which is set forth the thought: “in order that the knowledge of the divine glory may be conveyed and diffused from us to others through the preaching of Christ.” For if the knowledge remains undiffused, it has not the nature of a thing that lightens, whose light is received by the eyes of men. — $\acute{\epsilon}\nu \pi\rho\sigma\acute{\omega}\pi\omega \chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\upsilon$] belongs to $\pi\rho\delta\varsigma \phi\omega\tau\iota\sigma\mu\acute{o}\nu$, but cannot be explained *in persona Christi*, i.e. *in nomine Christi*, as Estius explains it after the Latin Fathers, but it specifies *where* the knowledge of the divine glory is to lighten: *in the presence of Christ*. For Christ is $\epsilon\iota\kappa\acute{o}\nu \tau\omicron\upsilon \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$, and Christians see unveiled the glory of Christ, iii. 18. He, therefore, who converts others to Christ makes the knowledge of the divine glory become *clear-shining* to them, and that *in the countenance of the Lord*, which is beheld in the gospel as the reflection of the divine glory, so that in this seen countenance that clear-shining knowledge has the *source* of its *light* (as it were, its focus). Probably there is in $\acute{\epsilon}\nu \pi\rho\sigma\acute{\omega}\pi\omega \chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\upsilon$ a reminiscence of iii. 7. The connection of $\acute{\epsilon}\nu \pi\rho\sigma\acute{\omega}\pi\omega \chi\rho.$ with $\pi\rho\delta\varsigma \phi\omega\tau\iota\sigma\mu\acute{o}\nu$ has been justly recognized by Estius, and established as the only right one by Fritzsche (*Dissert.* II. p. 170, and *ad Rom.* I. p. 188), whom Billroth follows, for the *usual* way of connecting it with $\tau\eta\varsigma \delta\acute{o}\xi\eta\varsigma \tau. \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ (comp. also Hofmann: “the glory of God *visible* in Christ”) would of necessity require $\tau\eta\varsigma$ repeated after $\theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$, since $\delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha$ is not a verbal substantive like $\phi\omega\tau\iota\sigma\mu\acute{o}\varsigma$, and consequently, without repeating the article, Paul would necessarily have written $\tau\eta\varsigma \tau\omicron\upsilon \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon \delta\acute{o}\xi\eta\varsigma \acute{\epsilon}\nu \pi\rho\sigma\omega\pi. \chi\rho.$ (see Krüger, §§ 50, 9, 9, and 8). The objection of de Wette against our view—an objection raised substantially by Hofmann also—that the $\gamma\nu\acute{\omega}\sigma\iota\varsigma$ is the subjective possession of the apostle, and cannot therefore become light-giving in the face of Christ, leaves out of consideration the fact that the $\gamma\nu\acute{\omega}\sigma\iota\varsigma$ is *objectivized*. Conveyed through preaching, the $\gamma\nu\acute{\omega}\sigma\iota\varsigma$ of the divine glory *gives light* (it would *not* give light otherwise), and its light-giving has its seat and source of issue *on the countenance of Christ*, because it is this, the glory of which is brought to view in the mirror of preaching (iii. 18).—Note, further, how there is something clumsy but *majestic* in the entire mode of expression, $\pi\rho\delta\varsigma . . . \chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\upsilon$, especially in the accumulation of the four genitives, as in ver. 4. (o⁴)

Ver. 7 ff. The apostle now (on to ver. 10) turns to the relation which the outward position, seemingly quite incongruous, bears to so glorious a calling. This pertained to the completeness of his *Apologia*, and to him—even without special attacks of opponents on this side—it thus most naturally suggested itself! We must put aside the supposition that his opponents had reproached him with his bodily weakness and persecutions (see, especially, Calvin, Estius, Mosheim, Flatt, Emmerling) as testimonies against genuine apostleship, since such a reproach, which must have affected not him only, but the apostolic teachers in general, is in itself quite improbable, and no trace of it is found in the whole of the following section. Still this section also is certainly not without indirect polemic bearing; for Paul, owing to the peculiarity of his apostolic character, had borne and suffered far more than the rival Judaistic teachers; and hence there was in the relation of his afflictions to his working quite a peculiar holy *triumph* for him over his foes. Compare the noble effusion in xii. 23 ff.

Ver. 7. Δέ] merely carrying on the train of thought: Now to compare our outward position with this high vocation, we have, etc. — τὸν θησαυρὸν τοῦτον] is referred either, in accordance with ver. 6, to the *light kindled by God in the heart* (Grotius, Flatt, Rückert, and others), or to the *ministerium evangelii* (Calvin, Estius, Bengel, Emmerling, and others). According to ver. 6, the *inward divine enlightening* (πρὸς φωτισμὸν κ.τ.λ.) is meant, and this definition of aim (πρὸς φωτ.) embraces in itself the *ministerium evang.* — ἐν ὅστροκίνοις σκεύεσιν] *in vessels of clay*. Contrast with θησαυρόν, because, for such a treasure, some more costly and lasting vessel seems suitable. Comp. the opposite in Arrian, *Epiet.* iii. 9: χρυσᾶ σκεύη, ὅστροκινὸν δὲ λόγον. We may add that Paul, who, in fact, speaks here not of *himself* alone (observe the plur. σκεύεσιν, and ver. 6, καρδίαις), wishes not to affirm some special weakness of himself, but to say generally: *Though we have so glorious a trust, yet is our body, the outward organ of our working, subject to the lot of being easily destructible*. Following Chrysostom, Theophylact, and Theodoret, most commentators have rightly found in σκεύεσιν a figurative designation of the *body*; while Billroth and Rückert, following Estius, Calovius, Wolf, and others, understand *the whole personality*. Against the latter view we may urge as well the characteristic ὅστροκίνοις, which can refer *only* to the *corporeal* part (comp. Gen. ii. 7; 1 Cor. xv. 47), as also ver. 16 and v. 1 ff. For examples of the use of ὅστροκινον σκεῦος¹ for the easily destructible corporeality (as Artemidorus, vi. 25: θάνατον μὲν γὰρ εἰκότως ἐσήμεαινε τῇ γυναικὶ τὸ εἶναι ἐν ὅστροκίνῳ σκεύει), see Wetstein. — ἵνα ἡ ὑπερβολὴ κ.τ.λ.] The design of God in this, namely, *in order that the abundant fulness of power, which comes to be applied, namely, in our ministry working πρὸς φωτισμὸν κ.τ.λ., ver. 6, in spite of all sufferings and persecutions (see what follows), may appear as the property of God, and not as proceeding from us*. The context furnishes that special reference of the ὑπερβολὴ τῆς δυνάμ. The opposite of the conception of ὑπερβολή is ἐλλειψις (Plato, *Protag.* 356 A, *Def.* p. 415 A, *al.*). — καὶ μὴ ἐξ

¹ To this category does not belong Plato, *Phaedr.* p. 250 C, which passage is compared

by Osiander, but there the body is figuratively presented as *mussel* (ὄστρεον).

ἡμῶν] καὶ μὴ ἡμεῖς νομιζόμεθα κατορθοῦν ἐξ ἑαυτῶν τι, ἀλλὰ πάντες οἱ ὁρῶντες τοῦ θεοῦ λέγωσιν εἶναι τὸ πᾶν, Theophylact. — The ἡ is to be taken *logice* of the being, which presents itself to *cognition*; as often with Paul (Rom. iii. 26, 4, 19, vii. 13). Rückert denies this, but comes back himself to the same view by giving the meaning thus: God wishes to be the One, and *to be recognized as such*, who alone, etc. The explanation of Tertullian, the Vulgate, Estius, according to which τῆς δυνάμ. is connected with τοῦ θεοῦ, is against the order of the words.

Vv. 8-10. A proof, based on experience, how this abundant power makes itself known *as the power of God* in the *sufferings* of the apostolic calling; so that, in spite of the earthen vessels, ver. 7, the apostolic working advances steadily and successfully. — ἐν παντί] having reference to all the first clauses of vv. 8 and 9, is neither to be supplemented by *loco* (Beza, Rosenmüller), nor is it: *in all that I do* (Hofmann), but is to be left general: *in every way*. Comp. vii. 5; 1 Cor. i. 5; and see on 2 Cor. xi. 6. Comp. the classic ἐν παντὶ κακοῦ εἶναι, Plat. *Rep.* p. 579 B; εἰς πᾶν κακοῦ ἀφικνεῖσθαι, Herod. vii. 118, and the like. — θλιβόμενοι κ.τ.λ.] *hard pressed, but not being driven into straits*. [*Pressed for room, but still having room*.—Stanley.] Matters do not come so far as that, in virtue of the abundance of the power of God! Kypke rightly says: στενοχωρία angustias hoc loco denotat tales, e quibus non detur exitus." For see vi. 4, xii. 10. Comp. Bengel. The reference of στενοχ. to *inward* oppression and *anxiety* (Erasmus, Luther, and many others) anticipates what follows. — ἀπορούμενοι κ.τ.λ.) *being brought into doubt* (perplexity, where we cannot help ourselves), *but not into despair*. Comp. i. 8.¹

Ver. 9. *Being persecuted, but not left* (by God) *in the lurch* (Plato, *Conv.* p. 179 A: ἐγκαταλιπεῖν καὶ μὴ βοηθῆσαι). [Stanley explains: "Pursued in our flight, but not left behind as a prey to our pursuers."] Comp. 2 Tim. iv. 16; Heb. xiii. 5. Paul here varies the mode of presentation, since the contrast does not again negative an action of *enemies*. Lydius (*Agonistic. sacr.* 24, p. 84 ff.), Hammond, and Olshausen think that we have here the figure of a foot-race, in which the runner overtaken ἐγκαταλείπεται (see the passages in Lydius); but the figure would be unsuitable, since the runners have a common goal (1 Cor. ix. 24). Hostile persecution in general is meant. Comp. διωγμός, xii. 10; Rom. viii. 35; 2 Thess. i. 4, *al.* — καταβαλλόμε. κ.τ.λ.] Figure of those *seized in the act of flight, who are thrown to the ground* (Hom. *Odyss.* iv. 344, viii. 508; Herod. ix. 63), *but not deprived of life*. This part thus appears in a most suitable relation of climax to what precedes; hence we should not think, as many do, of *wrestlers in the games* (comp. Plato, *Hipp. min.* p. 374 A). (P⁴)

Ver. 10. Extreme concentration of all suffering, as of all victory through the power of God. In this πάντοτε, corresponding to the ἐν παντί of ver. 8 and the αἰεί of ver. 11, is with great emphasis placed first. The νέκρωσις is *the putting to death*, like the classic θανάτωσις (Thucyd. v. 9. 7). In this

¹ There is no contradiction between this passage and i. 8, where an actual ἐξαποπεῖσθαι is affirmed only of a *single case*, and

in a *definite relation*. Here, however, the mental attitude *as a whole* is portrayed in single, grand strokes.

case the context decides whether it is to be taken in a literal or, as in Rom. iv. 19, in a figurative sense. Comp. Astrampsychus in Suidas : νεκροὺς ὁρῶν νέκρωσιν ἔξεις πραγμάτων, Porphy. *de Abstin.* iv. p. 418 ; Aret. pp. 23, 48 ; also ἀπονέκρωσις in Arrian, *Epict.* i. 5. Here it stands, as ver. 11 proves, in a literal sense : *At all times we bear about the putting to death of Jesus in our body, i.e. at all times, in our apostolic movements, our body is exposed to the same putting to death which Jesus suffered, i.e. to violent deprivation of life for the gospel's sake.* The constantly imminent danger of this death, and the constant actual persecutions and maltreatments, make the νέκρωσις τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, in the conception of the sufferer as of the observer, appear as something clinging to the body of the person concerned, which he carries about with it, although, till the final actual martyrdom, it remains incomplete and, in so far, resting on a *prolepsis* of the conception. On the *subject-matter*, comp. Rom. viii. 35 f. ; 1 Cor. xv. 31 ; Phil. iii. 10. The gen. τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, however, is not to be taken as *propter Jesum* (Vatablus and others, including Emmerling), nor *ad exemplum Christi* (Grotius, Flatt), but quite as in τὰ παθήματα τοῦ Χριστοῦ, i. 5 ; and it is altogether arbitrary to understand anything more special than *the great danger to life generally involved in the continual persecutions and afflictions* (xi. 23 ff.),—as *e.g.* Eichhorn takes it to refer to wounds received in the apostolic ministry (Gal. vi. 17), and Rückert, here again (see on i. 8), to the alleged sickness, from which Paul had not yet fully recovered. The right view is already given in Chrysostom : οἱ θάνατοι οἱ καθημερινοὶ, δι' ὧν καὶ ἡ ἀνάστασις ἐδείκνυτο. Comp. Pelagius. But τ. νέκρωσιν is *chosen* (not τ. θάνατον), because Paul has in mind the *course of events leading to the death* suffered by Jesus, which is mirrored in his own sufferings for Christ's sake. —[ἵνα καὶ ἡ ζωὴ κ.τ.λ.] *in order that also the life of Jesus, etc.* This is the *blessed relation supervening* according to God's purpose. Just as, namely, the continual sufferings and peril of death appear as the νέκρωσις of Jesus in the body of those persecuted, so, in keeping with that view, their rescued life appears as the same ζωή, which, in the case of Jesus, followed after His dying, through the resurrection from death (Rom. v. 10). The victorious *surmounting of the sufferings and perils of death*, from which one emerges saved as regards the body, is, according to the analogy of the conception of the νέκρωσις τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, *resurrection* ; and thus there becomes manifest, in the body of him that is rescued, the same *life* which Jesus entered on at His bodily resurrection. If, with Chrysostom, Cajetan, Estius, Mosheim, and others (comp. Flatt and also Hofmann), we should regard the preservation and rescuing as *evincing the effectual operation of the bodily glorified Jesus*, there would be unnecessarily introduced a different position of matters in the two parts of the verse ; as the νέκρωσις itself is thought of in the one case, we must in the other also understand the ζωή itself (not an *effect* of it). According to de Wette and Osiander, the thought of the apostle is, that in *his ineradicable energy of spirit in suffering* there is revealed Christ's power of suffering, in virtue of which He has risen and lives for ever ; comp. Beza. In that case a *moral* revelation of life would be meant, and to this ἐν τῷ σώματι ἡμῶν (comp. ver. 11) would not be suitable. — Notice, further, how, in ver. 10 f., Paul names only the name Ἰησοῦς, and how repeatedly he

uses it. “Singulariter sensit dulcedinem ejus,” Bengel. As bearer of the dying and living of the Lord in his body, he has before his eyes and in his heart, with the deepest feeling of fellowship, *the concrete human manifestation, Jesus*. Even the exalted One is, and remains to him, *Jesus*. A contrast between the earthly Jesus and the heavenly Christ, for whom the former is again deprived of life (Holsten), is, as the clause expressive of purpose shows, not to be thought of.

Ver. 11. An elucidation, and therewith a confirmation of ver. 10. — *ἀεί* (comp. vi. 10) is distinguished from *πάντοτε* as respects the *form* of the conception, just as *always* or *continually* from *at all times*. Comp. the classical *ἀεὶ διὰ βίον*, Heindorf, *ad Plat. Phaed.* p. 75 D ; also the Homeric *οἱ ἀεὶ θεοί*. — *ἡμεῖς οἱ ζῶντες*] brings out, by way of contrast, the *ἀεὶ εἰς θάνατον παραδιδόμεθα* : *we who live*, so that in this way the constant devotion to death looks all the more tragic, since *the living* appear as liable to *constant dying*. We are continuously the *living prey of death* ! The reference of Grotius, “qui nondum ex hac vita excessimus, ut multi jam Christianorum,” is alien to the context. Further, it can neither mean : *as long as we live* (Calvin, Beza by way of suggestion, Mosheim, Zachariae, Flatt, de Wette), nor : *who still*, in spite of perils of death, *remain ever in life* (Estius, Bengel, Rückert), which latter would anticipate the clause of aim, *ἵνα κ.τ.λ.* In accordance with his view of ver. 10, Osiander (comp. Bisping) takes it of the *spiritual* life in the power of faith. — *παραδιδου.*] by the persecutors, ver. 8 f. — *ἐν τῇ θνητῇ σαρκὶ ἡμ.*] designation of the *σῶμα* (ver. 10) as respects its material weakness and transitoriness, whereby the *φανερωθῆναι* of the *ζωὴ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ* is meant to be rendered palpable by means of the contrast. In *ἐν τῷ σώματι*, ver. 10, and *ἐν τῇ θνητῇ σαρκί*, ver. 11, there is a *climax* of the terms used. Rückert thinks, wrongly, that the expression would be highly unsuitable, if in what precedes he were speaking of nothing but persecutions. It was in fact the mortal *σάρξ*, which might so easily have succumbed to such afflictions as are described, *e.g.*, in xi. 23 ff. — *ἵνα καὶ κ.τ.λ.*] an emphatic repetition of the clause of aim contained in ver. 10, with a still stronger prominence given to the element there denoted by *ἐν τῷ σώματι ἡμῶν*, on account of which *ἐν τ. θν. σαρκὶ ἡμῶν* is here placed at the end. There is implied in it a *triumph*. Comp. on the thought of vv. 10, 11, Ignatius, *Magnes.* 6 : *ἐὰν μὴ ἀνθαιρέτως ἐχωμεν τὸ ἀποθανεῖν εἰς τὸ αὐτοῦ (Christ's) πάθος, τὸ ζῆν αὐτοῦ οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν ἡμῖν*.

Ver. 12. An inference from ver. 11 ; hence the meaning can be no other than : *Accordingly*, since we are continually exposed to death, *it is death whose working clings to us* ; but since the revelation of the life of Jesus in us goes to benefit *you* through our work in our vocation, the power opposed to death, *life, is that which exercises its working on you*. *ὁ θάνατος* and *ἡ ζωὴ* can, according to vv. 10 and 11, be nothing else than the *bodily* death and the *bodily* life, both conceived of as personal powers, and consequently the life not as *existent in Jesus* (Hofmann). It was death to which Paul and those like him were ever given up, and it was life which, in spite of all deadly perils, retained the victory and remained preserved. And this victorious power of life, presenting in His servants the life of the risen Lord, was active (comp. Phil. i. 22, 24) through the continuance thereby rendered possible of

the apostolic working among the Christians, and especially among the Corinthians (ἐν ὑμῖν), although they were not affected in like manner by that working of death. Estius (following Lombard) and Grotius (comp. Olshausen) take ἐνεργ. *passively*: “in nobis . . . mors agitur et exercetur . . . ut vicissim . . . per nostra pericula nostramque quotidianam mortem vobis gignitur, augetur, perficitur vita spiritualis” (Estius). But in the N. T. ἐνεργ. never occurs in a passive sense (see on i. 6), and according to vv. 10, 11, ἡ ζωὴ cannot be *vita spiritualis*, as even Osiander (comp. Ewald) here again interprets it. Calvin, Menochius, and Michaelis find in it something *ironical*: we are in continual deadly peril, while you are *in comfort*. Comp. Chrysostom, who, however, does not expressly signalize the ironical character of the passage. On ζῆν, *vita frui*, see Jacobs, *ad Anthol.* X. p. 70 ; comp. ζῆν καὶ εἶναι, Dissen, *ad Dem. de Cor.* p. 239. But the context gives no suggestion whatever of irony or of any such reference of ἡ ζωὴ (ὑμεῖς δὲ ἐν ἀνέσει, τὴν ἐκ τούτων τῶν κινδύνων καρπούμενοι ζωὴν, Chrysostom). As foreign to it is Rückert's view, which refers the first half of the verse to Paul's alleged sickness, and the second half to *the state of health of the Corinthians*, which, as Paul had recently learned through Titus, had considerably improved after a sickness that had been prevalent (1 Cor. xi. 30).—We may add that the first clause is set down *without μέν*, because Paul purposely avoids paving the way for the contrast, in order thereupon to bring it forward by way of surprise. “Infert particula δὲ *novam* rem cum aliqua oppositione,” Klotz, *ad Devar.* p. 356.

Ver. 13. A remark giving information (δέ; see on iii. 17) on ἡ δὲ ζωὴ ἐν ὑμῖν. For through the πιστεύομεν, διὸ καὶ λαλοῦμεν, is that very ἡ ζωὴ ἐν ὑμῖν ἐνεργεῖται rendered possible and brought about. The connection of ideas is frequently taken thus: “Though death works in us and life in you, we have yet the certain confidence that we too will partake of the life.” Comp. Estius, Flatt, Rückert. But in that case the relation of the two verses, 13 and 14, would be logically inverted, and the participial clause in ver. 14 would be made the principal clause; Paul must logically have written: “*Because, however, we have the same spirit of faith, which David expresses in the words, etc., we know,*” etc. According to Olshausen, Paul wishes to represent the thought that his career, so full of suffering, is a source of life to the Corinthians, as a living certainty wrought in him from above. But apart from the erroneous explanation of ἡ δὲ ζωὴ ἐν ὑμῖν, on which this is based (see on ver. 12), the very fact—the ἡ ζωὴ ἐν ὑμῖν ἐνεργεῖται—was something *consonant to experience*, and hence Paul in ver. 13 gives nothing else than an elucidation *consonant to experience*. According to de Wette (comp. before him, Erasmus, *Paraphr.*, who inserts the intermediate thought: *nec tamen ob id nos poenitet evangelii*), the course of thought is: “*But this working of death hinders us not from preaching the gospel boldly, since the hope of the resurrection strengthens us.*” In this way, however, he arbitrarily passes over the immediately preceding thought, ἡ δὲ ζωὴ ἐν ὑμῖν, to which, nevertheless, ver. 13 supplies an appropriate elucidation. According to Hofmann, Paul brings in a modification of the contrast contained in ver. 12, when he says that he has, while death works in him, still the same spirit as exists in

those in whom life works. But there is no hint of this retrospective reference of τὸ αὐτό (which would have required a σὺν ὑμῖν or something similar); and not even the thought in itself would be suitable, since his being in possession of the same spirit which his disciples, in whom his life was in fact at work, possessed, would be self-evident, and not a special point to be brought into prominence and asserted by the apostle. This also in opposition to Erasmus, Estius, Bengel, Schrader, and others, who explain τὸ αὐτό : *the same spirit, which you have*. — τὸ αὐτὸ πνεῦμα τῆς πίστεως] *i.e. the same Holy Spirit working faith*, not : *the believing frame of mind* (de Wette, comp. also Lipsius, *Rechtfertigungsl.* p. 176), which is not the meaning of πνεῦμα in Rom. viii. 15, xi. 8 ; 1 Cor. iv. 21 ; Gal. vi. 1 ; Eph. i. 17. τὸ αὐτό is the same *which is made known in the following saying of Scripture*, consequently the same *as the Psalmist had*. With this hero of faith the apostle knows himself to be on an equality in faith.¹ The πίστις which the Spirit works was with the Psalmist *trust in God*, with Paul *faith in the salvation in Christ* ; with both, therefore, the same fundamental disposition of pious confidence in God's promise (Heb. i. 11). — κατὰ τὸ γεγραπ.] *in conformity, in agreement with what is written*. This belongs to καὶ ἡμεῖς πιστεύομεν, for if it belonged to ἔχοντες (Calvin, Beza, de Wette, Ewald, and many others), αὐτό would be superfluous. — ἐπίστευσα, διὸ ἐλάλησα] *I have become a believer, therefore have I let myself be heard*, Ps. cxvi. 10, after the LXX., in which the translation of הִאֲמַנְתִּי כִּי אֶדְבָּר is incorrect, but might be retained by Paul, all the more seeing that in the original is contained the idea that the speaking proceeded from faith² (*I trusted, for I spoke*). — καὶ ἡμεῖς] *we too*, like the Psalmist. Hofmann, on the other hand, in accordance with his inappropriate view of τὸ αὐτὸ πνεῦμα τ. π., understands it : “in common with those, who have the same spirit.” — διὸ καὶ λαλοῦμεν] *on which account we also let ourselves be heard*, are not silent, but preach the gospel. Through this it happens that ἡ ζωὴ ἐν ὑμῖν ἐνεργεῖται. See on ver. 12. The καί before λαλ. is the *also* of the relation corresponding (to the πιστεύομεν).

Ver. 14. *Encouraging assurance* accompanying this λαλοῦμεν (not its contents) ; *since we are certain that*, etc. Comp. Rom. v. 3 ; 1 Cor. xv. 58. — ὁ ἐγείρας τ. κ. Ἰησ.] Comp. on 1 Cor. vi. 14 ; Rom. viii. 11. This designation of God contains the ground of faith for the conviction about to be expressed. — καὶ ἡμᾶς σὺν Ἰησοῦ ἐγερεῖ κ. παραστ. σὺν ὑμῖν] This is usually understood of the *actual resurrection from the dead*, and of the presenting *before the judgment-seat* of Christ. And this view is the right one, partly because it alone is in keeping with the definite expressions, partly because it is in the highest degree suitable to the connection, when Paul here at the close of what he says regarding his sufferings and perils of death expresses the certainty of the *last and supreme consummation* as the deepest ground of his all-defying courage of faith. This amid all afflictions is his *καυχᾶσθαι ἐπ'*

¹ There is ground for assuming that Paul looked on *David* as the author of Ps. cxvi., which no doubt belongs to a far later time ; it was customary, in fact, to ascribe to David the anonymous psalms generally.

² For the very different meanings given to the text of the original (Hupfeld, Ewald, *I have faith, when I speak*), see Hupfeld on Ps. cxvi., and Hofmann on this passage.

ἐλπίδι τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ, Rom. v. 2. Paul, indeed, expected that he himself and most of his readers would live to see the Parousia (1 Cor. xv. 51 f., i. 8, xi. 26 ; 2 Cor. i. 13 f.) ; but the possibility of meeting death in the deadly persecutions was always and even *now* before his mind (1 Cor. xv. 31 f. ; 2 Cor. i. 8, v. 18 ; Phil. i. 20 f., ii. 17 ; Acts xx. 25, 38) ; and out of this case conceived as possible, which subsequently he for the time being even posits as a certainty (see on Acts xx. 25), he expresses here in presence of his eventual death his triumphant consciousness ὅτι ὁ ἐγείρας κ.τ.λ. Hence there is no ground for explaining it, with Beza (who, however, again abandoned this view), Calixtus (*"suscitabit a morte sc. illa quotidiana"*), Schulz, Rückert, Neander, of the resurrection *in a figurative sense*, viz. *of the overcoming the constant perils of death* (vv. 10–12), which, it is held, is a resurrection *with Jesus*, in so far as through it there arises a fellowship of destiny with the risen Christ. This interpretation is not demanded by the correct reading σὺν Ἰησοῦ, as if this σύν (comp. Rom. vi. 4, 8 ; Eph. ii. 5 f.) presupposed the *spiritual* meaning. It is true that the raising of the dead takes place διὰ Ἰησοῦ, and has its basis ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ (1 Cor. xv. 21, 22) ; but Christians may be also conceived and designated as one day becoming raised *with Jesus*, since they are members of Christ, and Christ is the ἀπαρχή (1 Cor. xv. 23) of all who rise from the dead. The believer, in virtue of his connection with the Lord, knows himself already in his temporal life as risen *with Christ* (see on Col. ii. 12, iii. 1), and what he thus knows in faith emerges at the last day into objective completion and outward reality. — καὶ παραστήσει σὺν ὑμῖν] *and will present us together with you*. This is taken, according to the previously rejected figurative sense of ἐγερῆ, to refer to the presentation of *the conquerors over deadly perils*, or even in the sense : “and will bring us together again with you” (Neander, Rückert). But, according to the context, after the mention of the resurrection, it obviously denotes the presentation *before the judgment-seat of Christ* (v. 10 ; Rom. xiv. 10 ; Col. i. 22 ; Eph. v. 27 ; Luke xxi. 36), where the righteous receive the eternal δόξα (2 Tim. iv. 8). With Christ they have suffered ; with Him they have risen ; and now before the throne of the Lord their συνδοξασθῆναι (Rom. viii. 15) sets in, which must be the blessed result of their presentation before the Judge. Hence Hofmann is wrong in thinking that there is no allusion to the *judgment-seat* of Christ in παραστ. (R⁴) Comp. on Col. i. 22. In the certainty of this last consummation Paul has the deepest ground of encouragement for his undaunted working, and the presentiment of such a glorious consummation is made still sweeter to him by the glance at the *fellowship of love* with his Corinthians, *together with whom* he will reach the blessed goal unto eternal union. Comp. 1 Thess. ii. 19. Hence : σὺν ὑμῖν, which is an essential part of the inward certainty expressed by εἰδότες κ.τ.λ., which gives him high encouragement. We may add that the ὑμεῖς will be partly those risen, partly those changed alive (1 Cor. xv. 51 ff. ; 1 Thess. iv. 14 ff.).

Ver. 15. Σὺν ὑμῖν, which he has just used, is now made good in such a way as to win their hearts. “*With you, I say, for all of it is for your sake ;*” there is nothing of all that we have to suffer and that we do, which is not related to our advantage. Comp. 2 Tim. ii. 10. ἐστὶ simply is to be sup-

plied ; but *πάντα* sums up what is contained in vv. 7-13 (not merely ver. 12 f). Christ's death and resurrection, to which Chrysostom, Theodoret, and Grotius make reference, did not form the subject-matter of the preceding context. — *ἵνα ἡ χάρις πλεονάσασα κ.τ.λ.*] *in order that the grace, i.e. not only the divine grace consisting in the reception of the spirit of faith (Hofmann), but that which is at work in all our victorious suffering and labouring, increased by the increasing number, i.e. after it has grown in extent and influence through the increasing number of those who beyond ourselves have become partakers in it, may make the thanksgiving, which pertains to it, abundant (may produce it in an exceedingly high degree) to the honour of God.* There is a similar thought in i. 11 ; but in the present passage the thanksgiving is, in accordance with ver. 14, conceived as *on the day of judgment*. Note the correlation of *χάρις* and *εὐχαριστίαν*, as well as the climax : *πλεονάσασα διὰ τῶν πλειόνων* and *περισσεύσῃ* (1 Thess. iii. 12). On *περισσεύειν τι*, comp. ix. 8 ; Eph. i. 8 ; 1 Thess. iii. 12.—This is the construction adopted by Chrysostom (?), the Vulgate, Ewald, and others, including Rückert and Olshausen, who, however, refer *διὰ τῶν πλειόνων* to the *intercession* of the Corinthians, which is not at all suggested by the context. *Divergent constructions* are (1) “*in order that the grace, since it has become so exceeding rich, may contribute richly to the glory of God on account of the thanksgiving of the increasing number,*” Billroth, following Erasmus, Luther, Castalio, Beza, Calvin, Estius, Grotius, Bengel, Rosenmüller, Krause, Flatt, Osiander, and others. So, in the main, Hofmann also : (2) *in order that the grace, since it has shown itself so richly, may, through the increasing number, make the thanksgiving abundant to the honour of God.* So Emmerling, de Wette, Neander. Both are possible ; but since *διὰ* with the accusative would express the conception, *for the sake of*, here unsuitable, the former construction would lead us to expect *διὰ* with the genitive instead of *διὰ τ. πλ. τὴν εὐχαρ.*¹ (comp. i. 11, ix. 12) ; and with both we fail to find in *πλεονάσασα* a more precise definition of that *by which* the grace has become more abundant, a thing not directly involved in the connection (as in Rom. vi. 1). Besides, both are less in keeping with the symmetry of the discourse, which, in structure and expression, is carefully chosen and terse—features seen also in the collocation : *increased through the increasing number.*” These *πλείονες* are those who have been *converted* by the apostolic ministry, and in particular those *advanced in the Christian life*, who were just *individualized* by *δι' ὑμᾶς*.

Ver. 16. *Διό*] namely, on account of the certainty expressed in ver. 14 (partly elucidated in ver. 15), in significant keeping with *εἰδότες*, and hence not to be referred back to the faith of the preachers, ver. 13 (Hofmann). — *οὐκ ἐκκακ.*] as ver. 1. The opposite of *ἐκκακ.* is : *our inward man, i.e. our morally self-conscious personality, with the thinking and willing νοῦς* and

¹ The position of the genitive, inverted for the sake of emphasis, would have occasioned no difficulty according to *classical* usage. Thus, *e.g.* Plato, *Rep.* p. 523 D, and Stallbaum *in loc.*, also, generally, Kühner, II. p. 624. But Paul would hardly have for-

saken the usual order, *διὰ τὴν τῶν πλειόνων εὐχαρ.*, which would at any rate have likewise made the *τῶν πλ.* emphatic. He would have had no reason for resorting to that assumed hyperbaton.

the life-principle of the *πνεῦμα* (see on Rom. vii. 22 ; Eph. iii. 16 ; comp. 1 Pet. iii. 4), *is renewed from day to day, i.e.* it receives through the gracious efficacy of the divine Spirit continually new vigour and elevation, *τῇ πίστει, τῇ ἐλπίδι, τῇ προθυμίᾳ*, Chrysostom. But with this there is also the admission: *even if our outward man*, our phenomenal existence, our visible bodily nature, whose immediate condition of life is the *ψυχή*, *is destroyed, i.e.* is in process of being wasted away, of being swept off, namely, through the continual sufferings and persecutions, *μαστιζόμενος, ἐλαινόμενος, μυρία πάσχων δεινά*, Chrysostom. For though the continual life-rescues reveal the life of Jesus in the body of the apostle (ver. 11), yet there cannot thereby be done away the gradually destructive physical influence of suffering on the bodily nature. There is here a noble testimony to the consciousness that the continuous development of spiritual life is not dependent on the condition of the body ; but the view of Billroth, who finds in *ἀνακαίν.* *the growth of the infinite, the true resurrection*, is just as un-Pauline as is the opinion of *an inward invisible body* (Menken), or even of a *corporeality* of the soul (Tertullian). On the point whether the inward man includes in itself the germ of the resurrection of the body (Osiander), the N. T. says nothing. Rückert diverges wholly from the usual interpretation, and thinks that *διὸ οὐκ ἐκκακ.* is only an accessory, half-parenthetical inference from what precedes, and that a new train of thought does not begin till *ἀλλ'* : "I have that hope, and hence do not become despondent. But even if I did not possess it, supposing even that my outward man is actually dissolved," etc. Against this it may be urged that *οὐκ ἐκκακοῦμεν, ἀλλ' κ.τ.λ.* could not but present itself obviously to every reader as closely connected (*we faint not, but*), and that the whole interpretation is a consequence of Rückert's erroneous exposition of ver. 14. Hence Neander also gives a similar interpretation, but hesitatingly. — On *διαφθείρεται*, comp. Plato, *Alc.* i. p. 135 A : *διαφθαρήναι τὸ σῶμα.* — The *ἀλλ'* (*at, on the contrary*) in the apodosis, after a concessive conditional sentence, introduces *with emphasis* the opposite compensating relation ; see Fritzsche, *ad Rom.* I. p. 374 ; Nägelsbach on the *Iliad*, p. 43, ed. 2 ; Bäumlein, *Partik.* p. 11. — *ὁ ἑσῶθεν*] *the inward, inner man*. Regarding adverbs in *θεν* with the same meaning as their primitives, see Lobeck, *ad Phryn.* p. 128 ; Hartung, *Kasus*, p. 173. — *ἡμέρα καὶ ἡμέρα*] *day by day* ; *καθ' ἡμέραν, τὸ ἐφ' ἡμέραν* (Eur. *Cycl.* 336), in point of sense, *for ever and ever*, without interruption or standing still. A pure Hebraism, not found once in the LXX., formed after *יִם יִם* ; comp. *יִם יִם*, Esth. iii. 4 ; Gen. xxxix. 10 ; Ps. lxxviii. 20. See Vorst, *Hebr.* p. 307 f. — *ἀνακαινοῦνται*] Winer aptly remarks (*Progr. de verbor. cum praeapos. compos. in N. T. usu*, III. p. 10), that in *ἀνακαινοῦν*, *to renew, to refresh*, the question does not arise, "*utrum ea ipsa novitas, quae alicui rei conciliatur, jam olim adfuerit necne* ;" see on Col. iii. 10. Instead of *ἀνακαινοῦν*, the Greeks have only *ἀνακαινίζειν* (Heb. iv. 6), but the simple form is also classical. — The confession *εἰ καὶ ὁ ἔξω κ.τ.λ.* became a watchword of the martyrs. Comp. Cornelius à Lapide.

Ver. 17. Ground for the furtherance of this *ὁ ἑσῶθεν ἀνακαινοῦνται ἡμέρα κ. ἡμ.* from the glorious eternal result of temporal suffering. — *τὸ γὰρ παρὰντίκα κ.τ.λ.*] *for the present lightness of our affliction, i.e.* our momentary affliction

weighing light, not heavy to be borne. τὸ νῦν ἐλαφρ. τῆς θλίψ. and τὸ παρὸν ἐλαφρ. τῆς θλίψ. would each give a different meaning ; see Hermann, *ad Viger.* p. 783. For examples of the very frequent adjectival use of *παραντίκα*, see Wetstein, Heindorf, *ad Plat. Protag.* § 106, p. 620 ; Stallbaum, *ad Plat. Rep.* p. 558 A ; from Xenophon in Raphel. Bengel aptly remarks : “notatur *praesens breve*.” The near Parousia is conceived as *terminus ad quem* ; comp. 1 Pet. i. 6. — τὸ ἐλαφρὸν τῆς θλίψ.] like τὸ δεινὸν τοῦ πολέμου, *the horrors of war* (Plato, *Menex.* p. 243 B), χαλεπὸν τοῦ βίου (*Rep.* p. 328 E). Regarding the substantival use of the neuter adjective, whereby the idea of the adjective is brought into prominence as the chief idea, see Matthiae, p. 994 ; Kühner, II. p. 122. — καθ’ ὑπερβολὴν εἰς ὑπερβολήν] is definition of *manner* and *degree* to *κατεργάζεται* ; it works in *an abundant way even to abundance* an eternal weight (growth) of glory. In this—and how exuberant is the deeply emotional form of expression itself !—lies the measureless *force* and the measureless *success* of the *κατεργάζεται*. (s⁴) If, with Rückert, we sought to find in this an adverbial definition to αἰώνιον βάρος (Rom. vii. 13), it could only refer to αἰώνιον, and the *notion* of αἰώνιος would make this appear as unsuitable. Rückert is further wrong in thinking that the expression does not seem to admit of a precise verbal explanation. But on καθ’ ὑπερβ. see i. 8 ; Rom. vii. 13 ; 1 Cor. xii. 31 ; Gal. i. 13 ; 4 Macc. iii. 18 ; Bernhardt, p. 241 ; and on εἰς ὑπερβ. comp. passages like x. 15 ; Luke xiii. 11 ; Eur. *Hipp.* 939 ; Lucian, *D. M.* 27. 9 ; *Gymnas.* 28 ; *Tox.* 12 ; on both expressions Valckenaer, *ad Eur. Hipp.* l.c. — αἰώνιον ingeniously corresponds to the previous *παραντίκα*, and βάρος to the ἐλαφρὸν (comp. Plato, *Timaeus*, p. 63 C). There is contained, however, in βάρος¹ the *quantitative greatness* of the δόξα ; comp. βάρος πλούτου, Plut. *Alex.* 48 ; Eur. *Iph.* 419 ; Soph. *Ajax.* 130, and Lobeck thereon. It is similar to the German phrase “eine schwere Menge.” — κατεργάζεται ἡμῖν] *brings about for us*. The δόξα is conceived as *requital* for the θλίψις (Matt. v. 12 ; Luke xvi. 25 ; Rom. viii. 17 ; 2 Tim. ii. 12, 13), and in so far as its *effect*, the production of which is developed in the present suffering. It is not merely a *spiritual and moral δόξα* that is meant (Rückert, who irrelevantly appeals to Rom. iii. 23), but the *whole glory*, the aggregate glorious condition in the Messiah’s kingdom, Rom. viii. 17, 18 ff. ; Matt. xiii. 43. — μὴ σκοποῦντ. ἡμ. κ.τ.λ.] *since we do not direct our aim to that which is seen, i.e. since we have not in view, as the goal of our striving* (Phil. ii. 4), the visible goods, enjoyments, etc., which belong to the pre-Messianic period (τὰ ἐπίγεια, Phil. iii. 19) ; comp. Rom. viii. 25. Billroth wrongly understands the resurrection-bodies to be meant, which must have been derived from what precedes, and may not be inferred from v. 1. The participle is taken as *conditioning* by Calvin, Rückert, Ewald, Hofmann : *it being presupposed that we*, etc. ; comp. Chrysostom : ἀν τῶν ὁρωμένων ἀπαγάγωμεν ἑαυτούς. The μὴ would accord with this interpretation, but does not require it ; see Buttmann, *neut. Gr.* p. 301 f. [E. T. 351]. The former sense, *specifying the reason*, is not only more appropriate

¹ βάρος is not distinguished from ὄγκος by the latter having always the idea of *burden* (Tittmann, *Synon.* p. 158). The notion of *weight* is always contained in βάρος, and in

ὄγκος that of *bulk*. The idea of *burdensomeness* is in both words given solely by the context. Comp. on ὄγκος, used of abundant *fulness* ; Jacobs, *ad Anthol.* IX. p. 126.

in general to the ideal apostolic way of regarding the Christian life (Rom. v. 3-5, viii. 1, 9, 25 ; 2 Cor. iv. 18), but it is also recommended by the fact that Paul *himself* is meant first of all in ἡμῶν. On the more strongly emphatic *genitive absolute* (instead of μὴ σκοποῦσι τὰ βλέπ.), even *after* the governing clause, comp. Xenophon, *Anab.* v. 8. 13, i. 4. 12, and Kühner thereon ; see also Krüger, § xlvii. 4. 2 ; Stallbaum, *ad Plat. Symp.* p. 183 B ; Winer, p. 195 [E. T. 260]. With the Greeks, however, the repetition of the subject (ἡμῶν) is rare ; comp. Thuc. iii. 22. 1. — τὰ μὴ βλέπόμενα] Paul did not write τὰ οὐ βλέπόμενα, because the goods and enjoyments of the Messianic kingdom are to appear from the subjective standpoint of the ἡμεῖς as something not seen.¹ See Hermann, *ad Viger.* p. 807 ; Kühner, II. § 715. 3. Comp. Heb. xi. 7. — τὰ γὰρ βληπόμενα κ.τ.λ.] Reason, why we do not aim, etc. — πρόσκαιρα] *temporary* (Matt. xiii. 21 ; Mark iv. 17 ; Heb. xi. 25), namely, lasting only to the near Parousia, 1 Cor. vii. 31 ; 1 John ii. 17. — On the whole expression, comp. Seneca, *Ep.* 59.

NOTES BY AMERICAN EDITOR.

(L⁴) “ *It is hid to them that are lost.*” Ver. 3.

Nothing can be plainer than the doctrine of this passage. A man's faith is not a matter of indifference. He cannot reject the Gospel and yet go to heaven when he dies. This is not an arbitrary decision. There is and must be an adequate ground for it. The rejection of the Gospel is as clear a proof of moral depravity, as inability to see the light of the sun at noon is a proof of blindness. Such is the teaching of the Bible, and such has ever been the faith of the church (Hodge).

(M⁴) “ *Blinded the minds of them that believe not.*” Ver. 4.

The view of Meyer that unbelief precedes the blindness, that those who will not believe Satan blinds so that they cannot see, is scriptural, but is not taught here. Stanley gives the force of the genitive thus : τῶν ἀπίστων = ὥστε ἀπίστους εἶναι. Paul had said that the Gospel was hid to the lost. This he accounts for by saying that Satan had blinded their minds. The blindness therefore precedes the unbelief, and is the cause of it.—It does not seem necessary to limit the statement that Christ is the image of God to his state of exaltation, as the author does. Even in his humiliation he so represented God as that it could be said he that saw him saw the Father also (John xiv. 9, xii. 45).

(N⁴) “ *The God of this world.*” Ver. 4.

Satan is so called because of the power which he exercises over the men of the world, and because of the servile obedience which they render to him. It is not necessary, in order that men should serve Satan, and even worship him, that they should intend to do so, or even that they should know that such a being exists (1 Cor. x. 20). It is enough that he actually controls them, and

¹ Bengel aptly observes : “ Aliud significat ἀόρατα ; nam multa, quae non cernuntur, erunt *visibilia*, confecto itinere fidei ? ”

that they fulfil his purposes as implicitly as the good fulfil the will of God. Not to serve God is to serve Satan. There is no help for it. If Jehovah be not our God, Satan is (Hodge.)

(o⁴) “*To give the light of the knowledge.*” Ver. 6.

According to the author, the intention here is to give a reason for Paul’s being a servant to the Corinthians, viz. that God shined into his heart that he might give the light to others. But it agrees better with the context and the meaning of the words to view the brilliant passage as giving the reason why Paul preached the Gospel. The outshining of God in creative power so illumined the Apostle’s soul that he saw the divine glory in the face of Christ, and could not but set forth such majesty, excellence, and grace.

(p⁴) “*Troubled on every side,*” etc. Vv. 8, 9.

There is in these verses an evident climax, which reaches its culmination in the following sentence. Paul compares himself to a combatant: first hardly pressed, then hemmed in, then pursued, then actually cast down. This was not an occasional experience, but his life was like that of Christ, an uninterrupted succession of indignities and suffering (Hodge).

(q⁴) *Paul’s quotation from the Psalter.* Ver. 13.

In a footnote the author speaks of Paul as looking upon David as the author of the 116th Psalm. But, besides the fact that the Apostle does not say so, it may be insisted that even if he had spoken of it as David’s, it would not prove anything more than that he referred to it (just as believers have done for ages) as belonging to a collection which is called David’s, because he was the chief author of its contents. As for the quotation itself, Paul quotes the incorrect rendering of the Septuagint; yet, as the author justly remarks, both the Hebrew and the Greek contain the idea which led the Apostle to make the quotation, viz. that speaking is represented as the effect and proof of faith.

(r⁴) “*Shall present us with you.*” Ver. 14.

Certainly the idea of the judgment is foreign to the connection. “It is a fearful thing to stand before the tribunal of the final judge, even with the certainty of acquittal.” The reference is rather to the joyful, blessed presentation before God, referred to so often elsewhere by the Apostle. See xi. 2; Eph. v. 27; Col. i. 22; Jude 24.

(s⁴) “*A far more exceeding and eternal.*” Ver. 17.

The Revision of 1881 gives this weighty and impressive verse in a rendering which is exact, and yet faithful to our English idiom. The verse contains the whole philosophy of the Christian view of affliction. It does not deny the reality of earthly sorrows or underrate their power, as did the Stoics; but after allowing them all their force, calmly says that they dwindle into insignificance when compared with the exceeding and eternal glory to which they lead. But this applies only to believers, as appears by the next verse, “while we look,” etc. Afflictions have a salutary operation, provided that we look at the things which are eternal—look, *i.e.*, fix our attention upon them as an absorbing object.

CHAPTER V.

Ver. 3. εἶγε] Lachm. reads εἶπερ, following B D E F G 17, 80, and τινές in Chrys. One of the two is hardly a grammatical correction, but simply an involuntary alteration of the copyists. Hence the preponderance of testimony is decisive, and that in favour of εἶγε, which has the support of C K L S among the uncials, and of almost all the cursives, as well as the strong weight of all the Greek Fathers. (The testimony of the vss. and Latin Fathers is not available here.) — ἐνδυσάμενοι] ἐκδυσάμενοι is found in D* F G, Ar. pol. It. codd. in Chrys. and Oec. Ambrosiast. Tert. Paulin. Primas. Ambros. Marcion. Preferred by Mill,¹ Seml. Michael. Ernesti, Schott, Schneckenb. Reiche, Osiander, and others. Recommended by Griesb.; not adopted, but declared decidedly as correct, by Rück., comp. also Kling in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1839, p. 511; adopted by Tisch. But ἐκδυσ. is an old alteration, arising from the fact that ἐνδυσ., οὐ γυμνοί were not regarded as contrasts, and hence the former was found inappropriate and unintelligible. Lachm. and Ewald also defend the *Recepta* ἐνδυσ. — Ver. 4. After σκήνει Rück. reads τούτῳ, following D E F G min. and several vss. and Fathers. A defining addition. — Ver. 5. ὁ δούς] ὁ καὶ δούς is read by Elz. Scholz, Tisch. against B C D* F G S* min. and several vss. and Fathers. But comp. i. 22. — Ver. 10. κακόν] φαῦλον, favoured by Griesb., adopted by Tisch., is here (it is otherwise in Rom. ix. 11) too weakly attested (only by C and S among the uncials). — Ver. 12. οὐ] Elz. Scholz, Tisch. have οὐ γάρ, but against preponderating evidence. Addition for the sake of connection. — καὶ οὐ] Lachm. reads καὶ μὴ ἐν. But μὴ is only in B S and some cursives, Theodoret; while ἐν is found in B D* F G S and some cursives, Copt. Syr. Vulg. It. Clem. Ambrosiast. Pel., so that μὴ and ἐν have not *equal* attestation. μὴ is an emendation, and ἐν supplementary. — Ver. 15. εἰ εἰς] Lachm. Rück. read εἰς, following far preponderating testimony. εἰ was inserted for the sake of a connection assumed to be wanting. — Ver. 16. εἰ δὲ καί] B D* S* 17, 39 have only εἰ καί. So Lachm. Rück. δέ is only added by way of connection, just as the change of order καὶ εἰ in F G, Vulg., It. and Latin Fathers has been made for the sake of the connection, but likewise testifies to the non-genuineness of δέ. — Ver. 17. τὰ πάντα] is wanting in important authorities. Deleted by Lachm. and Rück. [So nearly all recent critics and expositors.] But how easily it may have been passed over on account of the following τὰ δὲ πάντα! Some versions omit the *latter*. — Ver. 21. γάρ] is, according to preponderating testimony, to be deleted, with Lachm. Rück. and Tisch. Instead of γινώμ., γενώμ. should be read, with Lachm. and Tisch., following B C D E K L S, min. Or. Chrys. *al.* These witnesses are decisive; F and G also suggest the aor.

¹ According to whom the attempts to explain ἐνδυσάμ. are alleged to be "*pleraque absurda, omnia dura, coacta et incongrua.*"

Reiche, *Comm. crit.* p. 362, quite agrees with him in this judgment.

Vv. 1-10. Still a continuation of what precedes (see on iv. 7).

Ver. 1. Γάρ] gives a reason for iv. 17. For if we were not certain that, etc., ver. 1, we could not maintain that our temporal tribulation works for us an eternal weight of glory. — οἶδαμεν] is here not the general *it is known* (Rom. ii. 2, iii. 19, vii. 14, viii. 28), but Paul is speaking (with the inclusion also of Timothy) *of himself*, as in the whole context, *He* is certain of this. Comp. Job xix. 25. — ἐὰν ἡ ἐπίγειος ἡμῶν κ.τ.λ.] *in case our earthly house of the tent* (our present body) *shall have been broken up* (comp. Polyb. vi. 40 ; 2 Esdr. v. 12). Paul here supposes the case, the actual occurrence of which, however, is left quite indefinite by ἐὰν, of his *not living to see the Parousia*. It is true that he was convinced for himself that he would live to see it (1 Cor. xv. 51), (τ⁴) but the opposite still remained to him a possible case, and he posits it here (comp. on iv. 14) as dependent on emergent circumstances and with an eye to the future decision. This correct view of the use of ἐὰν (see Hermann, *ad Viger.* pp. 822, 834 f. ; Klotz, *ad Devar.* p. 453) is sufficient to set aside the supposition that it is here equivalent to κἂν, *etiamsi* (Grotius, Mosheim, Schulz, Rosenmüller, also Schneckenburger, *Beitr.* p. 125), which is not the case even in passages such as Mark viii. 36 ; 1 Cor. iv. 15, xiii. 1-3 ; 2 Cor. xii. 6. — ἐπίγειος] *earthly*, i.e. *to be found on earth*. Comp. 1 Cor. xv. 40 ; Phil. ii. 10, iii. 19 ; Jas. iii. 15 ; John iii. 12. But the *special* notion of *transitoriness* only comes to be added through the characteristic τοῦ σκηνῶντος, and is not specially implied in ἐπίγειος (in opposition to Flatt and many others), for the present body is as ἐπίγειος, in contrast to the heavenly things, *in a general sense temporal*. — ἡ οἰκία τοῦ σκηνῶντος] is to be taken as *one* conception : *the house, which consists in the* (known) *tent, the tent-house*. It is wrongly translated *domum corporis* by Mosheim and Kypke (Rückert also hesitates as to this). For frequently as the profane authors, especially the Pythagoreans and Platonists, designate the body by σκῆνος (Grotius *in loc.* ; Alberti, *Obs.* p. 360 ; Dougltaeus, *Anal.* II. p. 122 f. ; Jacobs, *ad Anthol.* XII. p. 30), and seem withal to have quite abandoned the conception of the tent (see the passages in Wetstein, and Kypke, II. p. 250), still that conception always lies at the root of the usage, and remains the *significant* element of the expression. Comp. Etym. M. ; σκῆνος καὶ τὸ σῶμα παρὰ τὸ σκηνῶμα καὶ σκηνὴν εἶναι τῆς ψυχῆς, οἷον οἰκητήριον. And since Paul nowhere else uses σκῆνος of the body, and was led in quite a special way by figure of οἰκία to do so here, we must keep by the literal meaning of σκῆνος, *tent*, by which is set forth the *merely temporary destiny* of the earthly body. Comp. 2 Pet. i. 13, 14 ; Isa. xxxviii. 12 ; Wisd. ix. 15, and Grimm *in loc.* Chrysostom : εἰπὼν οἰκίαν σκηνῶντος καὶ τὸ ἐνδιάλυτον καὶ πρόσκαιρον δείξας ἐκτεῦθεν, ἀντέθηκε τὴν αἰωνίαν. There is nothing to indicate a particular allusion, such as to the dwellings of the Israelites in the wilderness (Schneckenburger, comp. Rückert), or even to the tabernacle (Olshausen).—On the two genitives of different reference dependent on one noun, see Winer, p. 180 [E. T. 239] ; and in Latin, Kühner, *ad Cic. Tusc.* ii. 15. 35. — οἰκοδομὴν ἐκ θεοῦ α *building originating from God*, furnished to us by God, by which is meant the *resurrection-body*. The earthly body also is from God (1 Cor. xii. 18, 24), but the resurrection-body will be in a special creative sense (1 Cor. xv.

38) one, not indeed that has proceeded from God,¹ but that is *given* by God. Note also the contrast of the *transient* (ἡ οἰκία τοῦ σκήν.) and the *abiding* (οἰκοδομή) in the two bodies. ἐκ θεοῦ is to be attached to οἰκοδ., not to be connected with ἔχομεν, by which a heterogeneous contrast would be introduced (according to Hofmann, with the earthly body, “which is made each individual’s own *within the self-propagation of the human race*”). The *present* tense, ἔχομεν, is the present of the point of time in which that καταλυθῇ shall have taken place. Then he who has died *has*, from the moment of the state of death having set in, instead of the destroyed body, the body proceeding from God, not yet indeed as a *real* possession, but as an *ideal* possession, undoubtedly *to be realized* at the (near) Parousia. *Before* this realization he has it *in heaven* (ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς belongs to ἔχομεν), just because the possession is still ideal and proleptic; at the Parousia the resurrection-body will be given to him from heaven (comp. ver. 2) by God, and till then it appears as a possession which *is preserved* for him for a time in heaven with a view to being imparted in future—like an estate belonging to him (comp. the idea ἔχειν θησαυρὸν ἐν οὐρανῷ, Matt. xix. 21; Mark x. 21; Luke xviii. 22) which God, the future giver, keeps for him in heaven. For a like conception of the eternal ζωή in general, see Col. iii. 3 f.; comp. Weiss, *bibl. Theol.* p. 375. The whole of this interpretation is confirmed by τὸ οἰκητήριον ἡμῶν: τὸ ἐξ οὐρανοῦ, ver. 2, which is correlative to the ἔχομεν . . . ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, ver. 1, in which, however, ἐν does not again occur, but ἐκ, because in ver. 2 τὸ οἰκητήριον . . . ἐπενδύσασθαι expresses the time of the realization of that possession described in ver. 1. As accordingly ἔχομεν expresses more than the mere *expectancy* (“in the event of our death we do not wholly perish, but have at the resurrection a spiritual body *to expect*,” Billroth), it is not to be transformed into *accipiemus* (Pelagius: “sumemus”), with Emmerling, Flatt, and many of the older expositors, nor is it to be said, with de Wette (comp. Weizel in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1836, p. 967; also Baur, II. p. 292 f., ed. 2; and Delitzsch, *Psychol.* p. 435 f.), that Paul has *overleaped* the middle state between death and resurrection, or has let it fall into the background on account of its shortness (Osiander). The ἔχειν takes place already from the moment of death and during the continuance of the intervening state, not simply from the resurrection. Photius, Anselm, Thomas, Lyra, and others,² including Calovius, Wolf, Morus, Rosenmüller, Hofmann, compare John xiv. 2, and on account of the *present* tense refer this οἰκοδομή to the glorious place of abode of the blessed spirits with God after death on to the resurrection. So also Usteri, *Lehrbegr.* p. 359 (comp. Schneckenburger, *l.c.*), explains it of a life in heaven immediately after death. But against such a view it may be decisively urged that οἰκία in the two parts of the verse must

¹ Klöpffer in the *Jahrb. für deutsche Theol.* 1862, p. 8 f.

² Calvin hesitates between the right explanation and this one; he says: “*Incertum est, an significet statum beatae immortalitatis, qui post mortem fideles manet, an vero corpus incorruptibile et gloriosum, quale post resurrectionem erit.*” Then he wishes to unite the

two views: “*Malo ita accipere, ut initium hujus aedificii sit beatus animi status post mortem, consummatio autem sit gloria ultimae resurrectionis.*” Billroth misunderstands this, as if Calvin were thinking of two different sorts of bodies, one of which we have till the resurrection, the other by means of the resurrection.

necessarily have the *same* reference (namely, to the *body*) ; hence also we cannot, with Ewald and Hofmann, think of the heavenly Jerusalem, Gal. iv. 25 f., Heb. xii. 22, and of the heavenly commonwealth, Phil. iii. 20. See, on the other hand, τὸ ἐξ οὐρανοῦ, ver. 2, on which Bengel rightly remarks : “ itaque hoc domicilium non est coelum ipsum.”¹ (4U) But because the οἰκία is ἐξ οὐρανοῦ, we can as little think of a pneumatic *bodily organ of the intermediate state* (Flatt, Auberlen in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1852, p. 709, Neander), of which the N. T. gives no teaching or even hint whatever. Rückert explains it, yet with much vacillation, of the immediate sequence of the exit out of the old and entrance on the new body ; but this is against 1 Cor. xv. 51–53, according to which the transfiguration of those who live to see the Parousia appears not as investiture with a new body after a previous κατάλυσις of the old, but as a sudden transformation *without* destruction. This also in opposition to Olshausen, who likewise seems to understand it of the transfiguration of the living. — ἀχειροποίητον] This epithet, denoting the *supernatural origin*, suits indeed only the *figure* (Mark xiv. 58 ; Acts vii. 48), and not *the thing in itself* ;² yet it occurred to the apostle the more naturally, and he could use it with the less scruple and without impropriety, seeing that he had just before represented the earthly body under the figure of a σκῆνος, consequently of an οἰκία χειροποίητος, so that now, by virtue of contrast, the heavenly body stood before his eyes as an οἰκία ἀχειροποίητος. Conversely, an adjective may, without incongruity, correspond to the thing itself and not to the figure, as in 1 Cor. xvi. 9. — ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς] belongs to ἔχομεν ; see above.—Lastly, it is to be observed that in the two halves of the verse (1) ἐκ θεοῦ and ἐν τοῖς οὐραν. correspond with ἐπίγειος, and (2) ἀχειροπ. and αἰώνιον with τοῦ σκῆνους.

Ver. 2. Confirmation of the certainty expressed in ver. 1, not an explanation why he should precisely mention the fact that he has such comfort in the prospect of death (Hofmann)—as if, instead of οἶδαμεν, λέγομεν or some similar *verbum declarandi* had preceded. — καὶ γάρ] does not here any more than elsewhere mean merely *for* (see, on the other hand, Hartung, *Partikell.* I. p. 138), but it means *for also*, so that καὶ is connected with ἐν τούτῳ. Previously, namely, the case was supposed : εἰάν . . . καταλυθῇ ; to which this καὶ γὰρ ἐν τούτῳ now corresponds, so that the train of thought is : “ we know that, in case our present body shall have one day been destroyed, we have a body in heaven ; for if this were not so, we should not already *in* the present body be sighing after the being clothed upon with the heavenly.”³ This longing is an inward assurance of the fact that, if our earthly house, etc. — καὶ γὰρ ἐν τούτῳ] The emphasis is on ἐν : *for also in this*. Not merely perhaps after the κατάλυσις supposed as possible (ver. 1) shall we long for the heavenly

¹ On the way of regarding heaven as *domicilium*, comp. Cic. *de Senect.* 23. 84 ; Tusc. i. 11, 24 : “ animos, quum e corporibus excesserint, in coelum quasi in *domicilium suum*, pervenire ;” also i. 22, 51.

² “ Metaphoricus sensus in talibus spectatur, non primarius,” Dissen, *ad Pind. Pyth.* iv. 158.

³ If that οἰκοδομὴν ἐκ θεοῦ ἔχομεν were not correct, it would be absurd, instead of being contented with the earthly habitation, to be longing already *in* it after being clothed upon with the heavenly habitation. Quite similar is the argument in Rom. viii. 22.

body, but *already now*, while we are not yet out of the earthly body but are still *in* it, we are sighing to be clothed upon with the heavenly. This is proved to be the right interpretation by the parallel in ver. 4, where our *ἐν* is represented by *οἱ ὄντες ἐν*. On *καί*, also, in the sense of *already* or *already also*, see Hartung, *l.c.* p. 135 ; Stallbaum, *ad Plat. Gorg.* p. 467 B ; Fritzsche, *ad Lucian.* p. 5 ff. With *τούτῳ*, according to the supposition of Grotius and others, including Fritzsche and Schrader, *σώματι* is to be mentally supplied, so that, as is often the case in the classic writers, the pronoun is referred to a word which was contained only *as regards the sense* in what preceded. See Fritzsche, *Diss.* I. p. 47 ; Hermann, *ad Viger.* p. 714 ; Seidler, *ad Eur. El.* 582. Rückert wrongly thinks that Paul in that case must have written *ἐν αὐτῷ*. This prevalent phenomenon of language applies, in fact, equally in the case of all demonstrative and relative pronouns ; see the passages in Matthiae, p. 978 f. Seeing, however, that the following *τὸ οἰκητήριον ἡμ. τὸ ἐξ οὐρανοῦ* proves that Paul also, in *ἐν τούτῳ*, was regarding the body *under the figure of a dwelling*, and seeing that he himself in ver. 4 has expressly written *τῷ σκηνεῖ* instead of *τούτῳ* the supplying of *τῷ σκηνεῖ* is to be preferred (so Beza and others, including Olshausen, Osiander, Neander, Ewald¹). Others take *ἐν τούτῳ* as *propterea* (see on John xvi. 20 ; Acts xxiv. 16), and refer it partly to what was said in ver. 1, as Hofmann : “ On account of the death in prospect ” (comp. Estius, Flatt, Lechler, p. 138), or Delitzsch, p. 436 : “ in such position of the case ; ” partly to what follows, which would be the epexegetis of it (Erasmus, Usteri, Billroth, the latter with hesitation). So also Rückert : *in this respect*. But the parallel of ver. 4 is decidedly against all these views, even apart from the fact that that over which we sigh is in Greek given by *ἐπὶ* with the dative or by the accusative, and hence Hofmann’s view in particular would have required *ἐπὶ τούτῳ* or *τοῦτο*. — *τὸ οἰκητήριον . . . ἐπιποθοῦντες* contains the *reason* of the sighing : *because we long for*, etc. Paul himself gives further particulars in ver. 4. Hofmann wrongly thinks that Paul *explains* his sighing from *the fact*, that his *longing* applies to that clothing upon, *instead of which death sets in*. The latter point is purely imported in consequence of his erroneous explanation of *ἐν τούτῳ*. It is the sighing of the *longing* to experience the last change by means of *the being clothed upon with the future body*. This longing to be clothed upon with the heavenly body (not, as Bengel and many of the older expositors would have it : with the *glory of the transfigured soul*, to which view Hofmann also comes in the end, since he thinks of the *eternal light* in which God dwells and Christ with Him lives) *extorts the sighs*. Against the reference of *ἐπενδύσ.* to an organ of the intermediate state, see on ver. 3, Remark. According to Fritzsche, the participle is only a continuation of the discourse by attaching another thought : “ *in hoc corpore male nos habentes suspiramus et coeleste superinduere gestimus.* ” But in that case no logical reference would be furnished for *καί* ; besides, it seems unwarrantable to supply *male nos habentes*, since Paul himself has added quite another participle ; and in general, wherever the participle seems only to continue the discourse, there

¹ See also Klöpfer in the *Jahrb. für deutsche Theol.* 1862, p. 13.

exists such a *relation of the participle to the verb*, as forms *logically* a basis for the participial connection. Comp. Eph. v. 16. According to Schneckenburger, στενάζομεν ἐπιποθοῦντες stands for ἐπιποθοῦμεν στενάζοντες, so that the chief fact is expressed by the participle (Nägelsbach on the *Iliad*, pp. 234, 280, ed. 3 ; Seidler, *ad Eur. Iph. T.* 1411 ; Matthiae, p. 1295 f.). An arbitrary suggestion, against the usage of the N.T., which is different even in the passages quoted by Buttmann, *neut. Gr.* p. 275 [E. T. 320], and to be rejected also on account of ver. 4, στενάζομεν βαρούμ. — The distinction between οἰκία and οἰκητήριον is rightly noted by Bengel : “οἰκία est quiddam magis absolutum, οἰκητήριον respicit incolam,” *house—habitation* (Jude 6 ; Eur. *Or.* 1114 ; Plut. *Mor.* p. 602 D ; 2 Macc. xi. 2, 3, ii. 15). — τὸ ἐξ οὐρανοῦ] that *which proceeds from heaven* ; for it is ἐκ θεοῦ, ver. 1. God furnishes from heaven the resurrection-body (1 Cor. xv. 38) through Christ (Phil. iii. 21), in the case of the dead, by means of raising, in the case of the living, by means of transforming (1 Cor. xv. 51). The latter is what is thought of in the present passage. — ἐπενδύσασθαι] With this Paul passes to another but kindred figure, namely, that of *a robe*, as also among the Rabbins (Schoettgen, *Hor.* p. 693) and the Neo-Platonists (Gataker, *ad Anton.* p. 351 ; Bos, *Exercit.* p. 60 ; Schneckenburger, *Beitr.* p. 127) the body is frequently represented as the robe of the soul. See also Jacobs, *ad Anthol.* XII. p. 239. But he does not simply say ἐνδύσασθαι, but ἐπενδύσασθαι, *to put on over* (which is not to be taken with Schneckenburger of the *succession* ; see, on the contrary, Plut. *Pelop.* 11 : ἐσθῆτας ἐπενδεδυμένοι γυναικείας τοῖς θώραξι, Herod. i. 195 : ἐπὶ τοῦτον ἄλλον εἰρίνεον κιθῶνα ἐπενδύνει), because the longing under discussion is directed to the living to see the Parousia and the becoming transformed alive. This *transformation* in the living body, however, is in so far an ἐπενδύσασθαι, as this denotes the acquisition of a new body with *negation of the previous death* (the ἐκδύσασθαι). This is not at variance with 1 Cor. xv. 53, where the simple ἐνδύσασθαι is used of the same transformation ; for in that passage τὸ φθαρτὸν τοῦτο is the subject which puts on, and, consequently, τὸ φθαρτὸν τοῦτο ἐνδύεται is quite equivalent to ἐπενδύμεθα, because in the latter case, as at the present passage, the self-conscious Ego¹ is the subject. — Regarding ἐπιποθεῖν, in which ἐπί does not make the meaning stronger (*ardenter cupere*), as it is usually taken, but only indicates the *direction* of the longing (πόθον ἔχειν ἐπὶ τι), see Fritzsche, *ad Rom.* I. p. 30 f.

Ver. 3. After ver. 2 a comma only is to be placed, for ver. 3 contains a supplementary definition to what precedes (comp. Hartung, *Partikell.* I. pp. 391, 395 f.), inasmuch as the presupposition is stated under which the ἐπενδύσασθαι ἐπιποθοῦμεν takes place : *in the presupposition, namely, that we shall be found also clothed, not naked, i.e. that we shall be met with at the Parousia really clothed with a body, and not bodiless.* The apostle's view is that, while Christ at the Parousia descends from heaven, the Christians already dead first rise, then those still alive are transformed, whereupon both are then caught away into the higher region of the air (εἰς ἀέρα) to meet the Lord, so

¹ The inward man. He is *put on* with the earthly body, and sighs full of longing *to put on over it* the heavenly body.

that they thus *at their meeting with the Lord shall be found not bodiless* (οὐ γυμνοί), *but clothed with a corporeal covering*¹ (ἐνδυσάμενοι). (v⁴) See 1 Thess. iv. 16, 17, and Lünemann's note thereon. This belief is here laid down as certainty by εἶγε κ.τ.λ., and as such it conditions and justifies the longing desire expressed in ver. 2, which, on the contrary, would be vain and empty dreaming, if that belief were erroneous, *i.e.* if we at the Parousia should be found as mere spirits without corporeality ; so that thus those still living, instead of being transformed, would have to die, in order to appear as spirits before the descending Christ. We cannot fail to see in the words an incidental reference to those of the Corinthians who denied the resurrection, and without the thought of them Paul would have had no occasion for adding ver. 3 ; but the reference is such, as takes for granted that the deniers are set aside and the denied fact is certain. As the whole of this explanation is quite in keeping with the context and the conceptions of the apostle, so is it with the words, regarding which, however, it is to be observed that the certainty of what is posited by εἶγε, *if namely*, is not implied in this particle by itself (in opposition to Hermann's canon, *ad Viger.* p. 834), but in the connection of the conception and discourse. Comp. on Eph. iii. 2, Gal. iii. 4, and Baumelein, *Partik.* p. 64 f. On καί, *also*, in the sense of *really*, see Hartung, *Partikell.* I. p. 132 ; and on εἰ γε καί, comp. Xen. *Mem.* iii. 6. 13. The participle ἐνδυσάμενοι refers, however, to the act of clothing previous to the εὐρεθῆσόμεθα, so that the *aurist* is quite in its right place (in opposition to Hofmann's objection, that the *perfect* is required) ; and finally, the *asyn-deton* ἐνδυσάμ., οὐ γυμνοί makes the contrasts come into more vivid prominence, like γάλα, οὐ βρῶμα, 1 Cor. iii. 2 ; Rom. ii. 29 ; 1 Thess. ii. 17, and often ; comp. ver. 7. See Kühner, II. p. 461 ; Fritzsche, *ad Marc.* p. 31 ; Hermann, *ad Viger.* p. 887. — The most current exposition on the part of others is : “ Si nos iste dies deprehendet cum corpore, non exutos a corpore, *si erimus inter mutandos, non inter mortuos*,” Grotius. So, following Tertulian (*de Resurr.* 41, though he reads ἐκδυσ.), Cajetanus, Castalio, Estius, Wolf, Bengel, Mosheim, Emmerling, Schrader, Rinck, and others, and, in the main, Billroth also, who, however, decides in favour of the reading εἶπερ, and deletes the comma after ἐνδυσάμ. : “ which (*i.e.* the being clothed upon) takes place, *if we shall be found* (on the day of the Lord) *otherwise than already once clothed* (with the earthly body), *not naked* (like the souls of the dead),” so that ἐνδυσάμ. οὐ γυμνοί εἶπ. together would be : *utpote jam semel induti non nudi inveniēmur*. Against that common explanation, which J. Müller, *von der Sünde*, II. p. 422 f., ed. 5, also follows with the reading εἶπερ, the *aurist* participle is decisive (it must have been ἐνδεδυμένοι).² Billroth, however, quite arbitrarily imports the *already once*, and, what could be more unnecessary, nay, vapid, than to give a reason for οὐ γυμνοί by means of ἐνδυσάμ. in the assumed sense : *since we indeed have already once re-*

¹ That is, with the *new* body, no longer with the old. See, in opposition to Klöpper, Hofmann, p. 130.

² Even Müller acknowledges that the *aurist* is anomalous, but makes an irrele-

vant appeal to Eph. vi. 14 ; 1 Thess. v. 8. In both passages, in fact, the having put on is longed for, and the *aurist* is therefore quite in order.

ceived a body! which would mean nothing else than : *since we indeed are not born bodiless*. Against Billroth, besides, see Reiche, p. 357 f. According to Fritzsche, *Diss.* I. p. 55 ff., ἐνδυσάμ. is held to be in essential meaning equivalent to ἐπενδυσάμ. : “*Superinduere* (immortale corpus vivi ad nos recipere) volumus, quandoquidem (quod certo scimus et satis constat, εἶγε) etiam superinduti (immortali corpore) non nudi sc. hoc immortalī corpore, sumus futuri h.e. quandoquidem vel sic ad regni Mess. ἀφθαρσίαν pervenīemus.” But while the ἐπενδυσάμενοι may be included as a species among the ἐνδυσάμενοι, as opposed to the γυμνοί, they cannot be meant exclusively. Besides, the thought : “*since we too clothed upon will not be without the immortal body*,” would be without logical import, because the *superinduere* is just the assumption of the future body, with which we attain to the ἀφθαρσία of the Messianic kingdom. According to de Wette, Paul says : “*if, namely, also* (in reality) *clothed, we shall be found not naked* (bodiless), *i.e.* as we then certainly presuppose that that heavenly habitation will be also a body.” So, in the main, Lechler, *Apost. u. nachapost. Zeitalt.* p. 138 f., Ernesti, *Urspr. d. Sünde*, I. p. 118, the latter taking εἶγε καί as *although indeed*. But the whole explanation is absurd, since the ἐνδυσις could not at all be conceived as at the same time its opposite, as γυμνότης ; and had Paul wished to lay emphasis on the fact that the clothing would be none other than with a *body* (which, however, was quite obvious of itself), he must have used not the simple γυμνοί (not the simple opposite of ἐνδυσάμ.), but along with it the more precise definition with which he was concerned, something, therefore, like οὐ σῶματος γυμνοί (Plato, *Crat.* p. 403 B, and the passages in Wetstein and Loesner). According to Delitzsch, *l.c.* p. 436, εἰ καί is taken as *although*, and ἐνδυσάμ. as contrast of ἐπενδυσάμ., so that there results as the meaning : *though, indeed, we too, having acquired the heavenly body by means of clothing* (not *clothing over*), shall be found not naked. As if this were not quite obvious of itself ! When clothed, one certainly is not naked ! no matter whether we have drawn the robe on or over. Chrysostom, Theodoret, Theophylact, and Oecumenius take ἐνδυσάμ. as equivalent to σῶμα ἀφθαρτον λαβόντες, but γυμνοί as equivalent to γυμνοὶ δόξης, for the resurrection is common to all, but not the δόξα. So also Usteri, *Lehrbegr.* p. 392 f. : “We long after being clothed upon, which event, however, is desirable for us only under the condition or presupposition that we, though clothed, shall not be found naked in another sense,” namely, denuded of the *garland* which we should have gained. Here also we may place Olshausen (comp. Pelagius, Anselm, Calvin, Calovius, and others), who takes οὐ γυμνοί as epexegetical of ἐνδυσάμ., and interprets the two thus : *if we, namely, are found also clothed with the robe of righteousness, not denuded of it*. Comp. also Osiander, who thinks of the spiritual ornament of justification and sanctification ; further, Hofmann on the passage and in his *Schriftbew.* II. 2, p. 473, who, putting a comma after εἶγε (“*if we, namely, in consequence of the fact that we also have put on, shall be found not naked*”), understands ἐνδυσάμενοι as a designation of the *Christian status* (the having put on Christ), which one must have in order not to stand forth naked and, therefore, unfitted for being clothed over. But where in the text is there any suggestion of a garland, a robe, an ornament of right-

eousness, a putting on of Christ (Gal. iii. 27 ; Rom. xiii. 14), or of the Christian *status* (1 Thess. v. 8 ; Eph. vi. 14, iv. 24 ; Col. iii. 10), or anything else, which does not mean simply the clothing with the future body ? Olshausen, indeed, is of opinion that there lies in *kai* a hint of a transition to another figure ; but without reason, as is at once shown by what follows ; and with equal justice *any* change in the figure *at our pleasure* might be admitted ! This also in opposition to Ewald's interpretation : "*if we at least being also clothed* (after we have had ourselves clothed, *i.e.* raised again) *be found not naked*, namely, *guilty*, like Adam and Eve, Gen. iii. 11." This would point to the resurrection of the wicked, Rev. xx. 12-15 ; if we belonged to these, we should certainly not have the putting on of glorification to hope for. But such a reference was just as remote from the mind of the apostle, who is speaking of himself and those like him, as the idea of Adam and Eve, of whom Beza also thinks in *γυμνοί*, must, in the absence of more precise indication, have remained utterly remote from the mind of the reader.

REMARK.—Whether the reading *ἐκδύσ.* or *ἐνδύσ.* be adopted, it is not to be explained of an *interim* body between death and resurrection (Flatt, p. 69 ; Schneckenburger, *l.c.* p. 130 ; Schott ; Auberlen in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1852, p. 709 ; Martensen, § 276 ; Nitzsch, Göschel, Rinck, and others, including Reiche,¹ *l.c.*), of which conception there is no trace in the New Testament ;² but rather, since *γυμνοί* can only refer to the lack of a body : *if we, namely, even*

¹ Reiche, p. 364 : "*Quo certior nobis est gloriosae immortalitatis spes (γάρ, c. 2), eo impensiore quidem desiderio, ut morte non intercedente propediem ad summum beatitudinis fastigium evehamur, flagramus ; attamen vero etiam corpore hoc per mortem exuti sentiendi agendique instrumento non carebimus.*" εἶγε καὶ is, in his view, *concessive, moderating* the desire to assume the heavenly body without previously dying (ἐπενδύσασθαι, ver. 2) : "Si igitur Deus votis (ver. 2) non annuerit, animum haud despondemus anxie futura anhelamus, persuasi scilicet, et post mortem illico mentem nostram immortalem in statum beatissimum erectum iri," etc. It is true that Reiche himself declares against the view that Paul here speaks of a *body intermediate* between death and resurrection ; but his own view amounts to much the same thing, since Paul, according to it, is supposed to grant that we, unclothed of the earthly body by death, will yet "post mortem illico" be found not naked.

² The manner also in which the origin of this corporeality has been conceived, namely, as the soul's self-embodiment by putting on the elements of the higher world (see, especially Güder, *Ersch. Chr. unt. d. Todten*, p. 336, also West. in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1858, p. 280), has nowhere in Scripture any basis whatever. See, in opposition to it,

Delitzsch, p. 438 ; Thomasius, *Chr. Pers. u. Werk*, III. 2, p. 436, who, however (p. 74 f.), for his part, answers in the affirmative the question, whether we are to think of "a change of clothing and clothing over of the new man out of the transfigured corporeality of the Lord, whose communion is the blessed bread and the blessed cup." In any case *γυμνοί* is the *negation* of corporeality. But the question remains untouched (comp. the cautious remarks of J. Müller, p. 425), what organ of its activity the soul retains in death, when it is divested of the body. On this point we have no instruction in Scripture, and conjectures (like Weisse's conception of the nerve-spirit) lead to nothing. The opinion that the *Lord's Supper* has a transfiguring power over the body goes partly *against* Scripture (because it presupposes the participation of the *transfigured* body of Christ) and partly *beyond* Scripture (because the latter contains nothing regarding any power of the Lord's Supper over the body). *Ultra quod Scriptum est* is also the conception in Delitzsch of the *body-like appearance* of the bodiless soul itself, or of an *outline* of the same resembling in form its true inward state. Such theories bring us into the realm of phantasmagoric hypotheses.

in the case that we shall be unclothed (shall have died before the Parousia), shall be found not naked (bodiless), in which the idea would be implied : assuming, namely, that we in every case, even in the event of our having died before the Parousia, will not appear before Christ without a body ; hence the wish of attaining the new body without previous death is all the better founded (ἐπενδύσασθαι). Similarly Rückert. Kling (in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1839, p. 511) takes it inaccurately : “although we, even if an unclothing has ensued, will not be found bare,” by which Paul is held to say : “even if the severing process of death has ensued, yet the believers will not appear bodiless on the day of the Lord, since God gives them the resurrection-body.”¹ The error of this view lies in *although*. No doubt Kling, with Lachmann, reads εἴπερ. But even this never means *quamvis* (not even in 1 Cor. viii. 5), and the Homeric use of εἴπερ in the sense : *if also nevertheless, if even ever so much* (*Odys.* i. 167 ; *Il.* i. 81, and Nägelsbach’s note thereon, p. 43, ed. 3), especially with a negative apodosis (see Hartung, I. p. 339 ; Kühner, II. p. 562), passed neither into the Attic writers nor into the N. T.

Ver. 4. An explanation defining more precisely, and therewith giving a reason for (γάρ), ver. 3, after a frequent practice of the apostle. Comp. iv. 10, 11. In this καί, *even* serves to emphasize the οἱ ὄντες ἐν τ. σκ., just as with ἐν τούτῳ in ver. 2. — The ἐν τούτῳ of ver. 2 is here more precisely defined by οἱ ὄντες ἐν τῷ σκηνῇ, in which οἱ ὄντες is prefixed with emphasis : *for even as those who are still in the tent, i.e.* for even as those whose sojourn in the tent is not yet at an end ; *already while we are still in possession of the bodily life*, which duration of time is opposed to the moment of the possible κατάλυσις τοῦ σκηνῶν, *when the tent is left*, and when the longing and sighing after the new body would be still stronger ; comp. on ver. 2. From the very position of the καί Hofmann is wrong in making its emphasis fall on βαρούμενοι, which extorts sighs from us, and then taking οἱ ὄντες ἐν τ. σκ. in *antithetic* reference to what is afterwards affirmed of these subjects, *since they prefer to remain in the earthly life* (comp. οἱ ζῶντες, iv. 11). The οἱ ὄντες ἐν τ. σκ. can only, in fact, be the same as the ἐν τούτῳ of ver. 2, which, however, Hofmann has already wrongly understood in another way ; the two expressions explain one another. — τῷ σκηνῇ] The article expresses the tent which is *defined* by the connection (the body). — βαρούμενοι] definition assigning a reason for στενάζ. : *inasmuch as we are depressed* ; not, however, *propter calamitates* (i. 8), as Piscator, Emmerling, Schneckenburger, Fritzsche suppose without any ground in the context, but the cause of the pressure which extorts the sighs is expressed by the following ἐφ’ ᾧ οὐ θέλομεν κ.τ.λ., so that βαρούμενοι, ἐφ’ ᾧ οὐ θέλομεν κ.τ.λ. is a more precise explanation of the τὸ οἰκητήριον . . . ἐπιποθοῦντες of ver. 2. — ἐφ’ ᾧ] *i.e.* ἐπὶ τούτῳ ὅτι, *propterea quod*, as Rom. v. 12 ; see on that passage. Comp. here particularly θυμὸν βαρύνειν ἐπὶ τινι, Pind. *Pyth.* i. 162 f. ; στενάζειν ἐπὶ τινι, Soph. *El.* 1291 ; Xen. *Cyr.* iv. 3. 3 : δακνόμενος ἐπὶ τούτοις. We feel ourselves as oppressed by a burden, *because we are not willing, i.e. have an antipathy, to unclothe, etc.* The oppres-

¹ So in the main did Chrysostom interpret the reading ἐκδυσάμενοι (for so we are to read in the explanation first quoted by him,

comp. Matthaei *in loc.*) : κἂν ἀποθώμεθα τὸ σῶμα, οὐ χωρὶς σώματος ἐκεῖ παραστησόμεθα, ἀλλὰ καὶ μετὰ τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἀφθάρτου γενομένου.

sive part of this οὐ θέλομεν ἐκδύσασθαι, ἀλλ' ἐπενδύσασθαι lies in the ever present possibility of the ἐκδύσασθαι. Emmerling and Fritzsche take ἐφ' ᾧ as *quare* (see Elsner, *ad Rom.* v. 12 ; Matthiae, p. 1373) : “Nam in hoc corpore ad calamitates valde ingemisco (καὶ . . . γὰρ βαρύν.) et propter hanc ipsam malorum molem (ἐφ' ᾧ) nolo quidem, *ut haec propulsetur*, mortem oppetere (ἐκδυσ.),” etc. But there is nothing of the *malorum* moles in the context ; and if we should wish, as the context allowed, with Osiander and older commentators, to refer βαρούμ. to the pressure which *the body as such* (the σκῆνος) causes to us by its onus peccati et crucis (comp. Wisd. ix. 15), and then to explain ἐφ' ᾧ : *and in order to get rid of this pressure* ; this would be at variance with the parallel in ver. 2, according to which the sighing must appear to be caused by the special longing (which in ver. 4 is, by way of more precise definition, designated as an oppressing one), not by another pressure.¹ This, at the same time, in opposition to Usteri and Schneckenburger, who take it as *whereupon* (comp. Kühner II. p. 298). According to Beza, it means *in quo*, sc. tabernaculo, and, according to Flatt, even *although*. At variance with linguistic usage. Ewald, taking βαρούμ. of the burden of the whole earthly existence, explains it : “*in so far as we wish not to be unclothed*, and so set forth as naked and guilty and cast into hell, *but to be clothed over*.” Against this it may be urged that ἐφ' ᾧ does not mean *quatenus* (ἐφ' ὅσον), and that the interpretation of “being unclothed” in the sense of *reum fieri* is not grounded in the text ; see on ver. 3. — θέλομεν] Out of this we are not, with Grotius, Emmerling, and others, to make *malumus* ; otherwise ἡ must have stood instead of ἀλλά, 1 Cor. xiv. 19. The οὐ θέλειν is the *nolle*, the *not being willing* (Baeumlein, *Partik.* p. 278 ; Ameis on *Hom. Od.* ii. 274), of the disinclination of *natural feeling*. — ἀλλ'] sc. θέλομεν. — ἵνα καταποθῇ κ.τ.λ.] We wish to be clothed over, *in order that*, in this desired case, *what is mortal in us may be swallowed up* (may be annihilated, comp. 1 Cor. xiv. 54) *by life*, i.e. by the new, immortal power of life which is imparted to us in the moment of the change (of the ἐπενδύσασθαι). “Ὡσπερ ἀνίσχον τὸ φῶς φροῦδον τὸ σκότος ποιεῖ, οὕτως ἡ ἀνώλεθρος ζωὴ τὴν φθορὰν ἀφανίζει, Theodoret. (v⁴)

REMARK.—There is no *fear* of death in this utterance of the apostle, but rather the *shrinking* from death, that pertains to human nature—the shrinking from the *process* of death as a painful one. His wish was not to die first before the Parousia and then to be raised up, but to be transformed alive ; and what man, to whom the nearness of the Parousia was so certain, could have wished otherwise? His *courage* in confronting death, which was no Stoical *contempt* of death, remained untouched by it.

Ver. 5. Δέ] not antithetic (Hofmann), but continuative ; this wish is no groundless longing, but we are placed by God in a position for the longed-

¹ Osiander : “wherefore we long to have ourselves not unclothed, but clothed over, because in the very act of dying the pressure of the tabernacle becomes heaviest, when it, as it were, collapses over its inhabitant.” It is

self-evident that of this explication of ἐφ' ᾧ there is nothing in the text: even apart from the fact, that Osiander explains as if the words were ἐφ' ᾧ θέλομεν οὐκ ἐκδύσασθαι κ.τ.λ.

for change which swallows up death. *Now He who has made us ready for this very thing is God.* — εἰς αὐτὸ τοῦτο] *for this very behalf, for this very thing*, Rom. ix. 17, xiii. 6 ; Eph. vi. 18, 22 ; Col. iv. 8. According to the context, it cannot apply to anything else than to the ἐπενδύσασθαι, whereby the mortal will be swallowed up of life. *For this* precisely Paul knew his individuality to be disposed by *God*, namely (see what follows) through the Holy Spirit, in the possession of which he had the divine guarantee that at the Parousia he should see his mortal part swallowed up of life, and consequently should not be amongst those liable to eternal destruction. In this way the usual reference of αὐτὸ τοῦτο to the *eternal glory* is to be limited more exactly in accordance with the context ; comp. also Maier. Bengel wrongly refers it to the *sighing*, pointing to Rom. viii. 23.¹ But how inappropriate this is to the context ! And how unsuitable in that case would be the description of the Holy Spirit as ἀρραβών, since, according to Bengel, He is to be conceived as “*suspiria operans*” ! Quite as unsuitable is the reference of κατεργ. to the *creation* (Chrysostom, Theodoret, Theophylact, Beza, and others, also Schneckenburger), which has no place here even as the beginning of the preparation indicated (in opposition to Ewald) ; Rückert remains undecided. — ὁ δοὺς ἡμῖν κ.τ.λ.] predicative more precise definition of the previous ὁ δὲ κατεργ. ἡμᾶς . . . θεός ; *He who (quippe qui) has given to us the Spirit as earnest* ; see on i. 22. *As earnest*, namely, of the fact that we shall not fail to be clothed upon with the heavenly body at the Parousia (which Paul was convinced he would live to see). Comp. Rom. viii. 11, and the Remark thereon. The usual reference of τ. ἀρραβ. : *arrham futurae gloriae*, is here too general for the context. The view of Hofmann regarding ὁ δοὺς ἡμῖν κ.τ.λ., that the possession of the Spirit, etc., cancels the distinction between being unclothed and being clothed over, and *takes away the natural shrinking from death*, falls with his explanation of κατεργασ. ἡμ. εἰς αὐτὸ τοῦτο ; see the Remark.

Ver. 6. The resulting effect of ver. 5 on the apostle's tone of mind.—Estius (comp. Erasmus, *Annot.*) rightly saw that the participle does not stand for the finite verb (as Flatt still holds, with most of the older commentators), but that ver. 6 is an anacoluthon, as the *construction* is quite

¹ This reference has been in substance repeated by Hofmann (comp. also his *Schriftbew.* II. 2, p. 475 f.). In place of his former misinterpretation, according to which he took κατεργάζεσθαι as to *work down*, break the spirit (see, in opposition to this, my third edition, p. 115, Remark), he has substituted the other erroneous explanation, that κατεργάζεσθαι is to be held as “*to bring one to the point of doing something*,” that εἰς αὐτὸ τοῦτο applies to the *disinclination, to being unclothed*, and that the means by which God brings us to the point of not wishing to be unclothed is obviously the *terribleness of death*. The last point is purely imported, and the whole explanation is excluded by its very inconsistency with

the language used in the passage. For κατεργάζεσθαι means, with Greek writers, *to bring one to something*, but always only in the sense *to prevail on one for something* for which we wish to get him, *to win him for one's ends*, whether this be effected by persuasion or by other influence directed to the end. So also Judg. xvi. 16 ; Xen. *Mem.* ii. 3. 11. Our expression *to work on a person* is similar. Comp. also Xen. *Mem.* ii. 3. 16 ; Herod. vii. 6 (κατεργάσατο καὶ ἀνέπεισε), ix. 108 ; Strabo, x. 5, p. 483 (πειθοῖ κατεργάζονται). In the N. T. the word never means anything else than *to set at work, bring about*, and in this sense it occurs frequently in Paul. Nor is it otherwise used here.

broken off by ver. 7, but the *thought* is taken up again with *θαρροῦμεν δέ* in ver. 8. See Fritzsche, *Diss.* II. p. 43 ff.; Winer, p. 533 [E. T. 717 f.]; Buttmann, *neut. Gram.* p. 252 [E. T. 292]. We must therefore not treat ver. 7 (Beza and others), nor even vv. 7 and 8 (Olshausen, Ewald), as a parenthesis. Paul intended to write : *θαρροῦντες οὖν πάντοτε καὶ εἰδότες . . . κυρίου, εὐδοκοῦμεν μᾶλλον κ.τ.λ.*, but was carried away from this by the intervening thought of ver. 7, and accordingly wrote as he has done. Comp. on ver. 8. Hofmann's opinion, that *θαρροῦμεν δέ κ.τ.λ.* is apodosis to the participial protasis *θαρροῦντες οὖν κ.τ.λ.*, would only be grammatically tenable (comp. on Acts xiii. 45) if there were no *δέ* in ver. 8. This *δέ*, as is always the case with *δέ* of the apodosis, even in the examples in Hartung, I. p. 186, would be adversative (*on the contrary*), which is not *suitable* here, and is not to be logically supported by the added *κ. εὐδοκ. μᾶλλον* (see on ver. 8). — *θαρροῦντες*] in all afflictions, iv. 17. — *πάντοτε*] In no time of trouble does Paul know himself deserted by this confident courage, iv. 8 ff., vi. 4 ff. — *καὶ εἰδότες κ.τ.λ.*] This likewise follows from ver. 5, and likewise serves as ground for the *εὐδοκοῦμεν κ.τ.λ.* of ver. 8 ; hence it is not, with Calvin, to be explained : *quia scimus* (as giving a reason for the *θαρροῦντες*), nor with Estius, Rosenmüller, Emmerling, Flatt, Olshausen, in a limiting sense : *while we yet*, or *although we know*. — *ἐνδημοῦντες ἐν τῷ σώμ.*] *being at home in the body*, i.e. while the body is the place of our home. The body is here also conceived as *οἰκία* (not *civitas*, as Rückert, de Wette, Osiander, and others hold), and that an *οἰκία out of which we have not yet migrated*, Erasmus : “*quamdiu domi sumus in hoc corporis habitaculo.*” Comp. Plato, *Legg.* xii. p. 594 B : *ἐὰν δὲ ἀποδημῶν οἰκίας δεσπότης τυγχάνῃ*, Aesch. *Choeph.* 569. — *ἐκδημοῦμεν ἀπὸ τ. κυρ.*] *peregre absumus a Domino*. For in respect to the future eternal home *with Christ* (1 Thess. iv. 17 ; Phil. i. 23, iii. 20 ; Heb. xi. 13, xiii. 14), the temporary home in the earthly body is a sojourn *abroad*, an *ἐκδημία*, which keeps us *at a distance from Christ*. On *ἀπὸ τ. κυρ.*, comp. Rom. ix. 3 ; Ameis on Hom. *Od.* xiv. 525, appendix.

Ver. 7. Reason assigned for the *ἐνδημοῦντες . . . κυρίου*. *For through faith we walk*, etc. ; faith is the sphere through which we walk, i.e. *faith is the element through which our earthly life moves*. If we walked *διὰ εἶδους*, seeing that this presupposes the being together with Christ, we should not be *ἐκδημοῦντες ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου*. The object of *faith* we must from the whole connection conceive to be *the Lord* in His glory, whose real form (*τὸ εἶδος*) we shall only have before us when we are with Him. Comp. Rom. viii. 17 ; 1 Thess. iv. 17 ; John xvii. 24 ; 1 Pet. i. 8, *al.* — *διὰ πίστεως*] quite in accordance with the Greek phrase *διὰ δικαιοσύνης ἵεναι*. Comp. *περιπατεῖν διὰ τοῦ φῶτος*, Rev. xxi. 24, and the classical expressions *πορεύεσθαι διὰ τῶν ἡδονῶν* and the like ; see, in general, Valckenaer, *ad Phoeniss.* 402 ; Heindorf, *ad Protag.* p. 323 A ; Hermann, *ad Oed. Col.* 905 ; Bernhardt, p. 235. — *οὐ διὰ εἶδους*] i.e. *not so, that we are surrounded by the appearance*, not so, that we have before us Christ, the Exalted One, in His real appearance and form, i.e. in His visible *δόξα*, and that this glorious *εἶδος* shies round us in our walk. Comp. John xvii. 24, and the *πρόσωπον πρὸς πρόσωπον*, 1 Cor. xiii. 12. *εἶδος* never means, as it is mostly explained, vision (not even in Num. xii. 8), but

always *species*. (x⁴) The Vulgate renders rightly : *per speciem*. See Luke iii. 22, ix. 29 ; John v. 37 ; 1 Thess. v. 22 ; Duncan, *Lex.*, ed. Rost, p. 333 ; Ast, *Lex. Plat.* I. p. 607 f. ; Tittmann, *Synon.* p. 119, who, however, with the assent of Lipsius (*Rechtfertigungsl.* p. 100), wrongly takes it : *externa rerum specie captum vivere*, so that the meaning would be : “ Vita nostra immortalī illa spe, non harum rerum vana specie regitur.” According to this view, different objects would quite arbitrarily be assumed for πίστις and εἶδος ; and further, where Paul specifies with περιπατεῖν that by which it is *defined*, he uses as a prepositional expression not διὰ, but κατὰ (Rom. viii. 4, xiv. 15, *al.*), or renders palpable the manner of the walking by ἐν (iv. 2 ; Rom. vi. 4, *al.*), or characterizes it by the dative, as xii. 18 ; Gal. v. 16. These reasons tell also in opposition to Hofmann, who explains διὰ of the walk, *which has its quality from faith*, etc., and εἶδος of an outward form *of the walker himself*, in which the latter presents himself as visible.—Regarding the relation of the διὰ πίστεως to the διὰ εἶδους, observe that in the temporal life we have the πίστις, and not the εἶδος, while in the future world through the Parousia there is added to the πίστις also the εἶδος, but the former does not thereby cease, it rather remains eternal (1 Cor. xiii. 13).

Ver. 8. *But we have good courage and are well pleased*, etc. With this Paul resumes the thought of ver. 6, and carries it on, yet without keeping to the construction there begun. The *idea* of the θάρροῦμεν must in this resumption be the same as that of the θάρροῦντες in ver. 6, namely, the idea of confident courage *in suffering*. This in opposition to Hofmann, who takes θάρροῦντες rightly of courage *in suffering*, but θάρροῦμεν of courage *in death*, making the infinitive ἐκδημῆσαι depend also on θάρροῦμεν (see below). — δέ, no doubt, links on again the discourse interrupted by the parenthesis (Hermann, *ad Viger.* p. 847 ; Pflugk, *ad Eurip. Hec.* 1211 ; Fritzsche, *Diss.* II. p. 21), which may also happen, where no δέ has preceded (Klotz, *ad Devar.* p. 377) ; since, however, θάρροῦντες is not repeated here, we must suppose that Paul has quite dropped the plan of the discourse begun in ver. 6 and broken off by ver. 7, and returns by the way of contrast to what was said in ver. 6. Accordingly there occurs an adversative reference to the previous διὰ πιστ. περιπατοῦμεν, οὐ διὰ εἶδους, in so far as this state of things as to the course of his temporal life does not make the apostle at all discontented and discouraged, but, on the contrary, leaves his θάρρειν, already expressed in ver. 6, quite untouched, and makes his desire tend rather towards being from home, etc. Comp. Hartung, I. p. 173. 2 ; Klotz, *l.c.* Thus there is a logical reason why Paul has not written οὐν. Comp. on Eph. ii. 4. — On εὐδοκεῖν in the sense of being pleased, of *Placet mihi*, comp. 1 Cor. i. 21 ; Gal. i. 15 ; Col. i. 19 ; 1 Thess. ii. 8 ; Fritzsche, *ad Rom.* II. p. 370. — ἐκδημῆσαι ἐκ τοῦ σώματος] *to be-from-home out of the body*, is not to be understood of the change at the Parousia (Kaeuffer, *ζωὴ αἰών.*, p. 80 f.), but, in accordance with the context, must be the opposite of ἐνδημοῦντες ἐν τῷ σώματι, ver. 6 ; consequently in substance not different from ἐκδύσασθαι, ver. 4. Hence the only right interpretation is the usual one of *dying*, in consequence of which we *are-from-home out of the body*. Comp. Phil. i. 23 ; Plato, *Phaed.* p. 67, B, C. The infinitive is dependent only on εὐδοκοῦμεν, not also on θάρροῦμεν (Hofmann),

since *θαρρῆν* with the infinitive means *to venture something, to undertake to do something*, which would not suit here (comp. Xen. *Cyr.* viii. 8. 6 ; Herodian, ii. 10. 13),—even apart from the fact that this use of *θαρρῆν* (equivalent to *τολμᾶν* (is foreign to the N. T. and rare even among Greek writers. The *εὐδοκοῦμεν κ.τ.λ.* is something *greater* than the *θαρροῦμεν*. This passage stands to ver. 4, where Paul has expressed the desire not to die but to be transformed alive, in the relation not of contradiction, but of *climax*; the shrinking from the process of dying is, through the consideration contained in ver. 5 and in the feeling of the courage which it gives (ver. 6), now overcome, and in place of it there has now come the inclination rather (*μᾶλλον*) to see the present relation of *ἐνδημεῖν ἐν τῷ σώματι* and *ἐκδημεῖν ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου* (ver. 6) *reversed*, rather,¹ therefore, *ἐκδημηῆσαι ἐκ τοῦ σώματος καὶ ἐνδημηῆσαι πρὸς τὸν κύριον*, which will take place through death, if this should be appointed to him in his apostolic conflicts and sufferings (iv. 7 ff.), for in that case his spirit, having migrated from his body, will not, separated from Christ, come into Hades, but will be at home with the Lord in heaven—a state the blessedness of which will later, at the day of the Parousia, receive the consummation of glory. The certainty of coming by martyrdom into heaven to Christ is consequently not to be regarded as a certainty only apprehended subsequently by Paul. See Phil. i. 26, Remark.

Ver. 9. *Therefore*, because we *εὐδοκοῦμεν κ.τ.λ.*, ver. 8, *we exert ourselves also*. Bengel : “ut assequamur quod optamus.” — *φιλοτιμ.*] denotes the striving, in which the end aimed at is regarded as a *matter of honour*. See on Rom. xv. 20. Bengel well says : “haec una ambitio legitima.” But there is no hint of a contrast with the “*honour-coveting courage of the heathen in dying*” (Hofmann). — *εἴτε ἐνδημοῦντες, εἴτε ἐκδημοῦντες*] is either connected with *φιλοτιμ.* (Calvin and others, including Billroth, Rückert, de Wette, Ewald, Osiander) or with *εὐάρεστοι αὐτῷ εἶναι* (so Chrysostom and many others, including Castalio, Beza, Estius, Grotius, Bengel, Emmerling, Flatt, Hofmann). The decision must depend upon the *explanation*. Chrysostom, Calvin, and others, including Flatt and Billroth, supply with *ἐνδημ.* : *πρὸς τὸν κύριον*, and with *ἐκδημ.* : *ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου*. In that case it must be connected with *εὐάρεστοι αὐτῷ εἶναι* (Chrysostom : *τὸ γὰρ ζητούμενον τοῦτό ἐστί φησιν· ἂν τε ἐκεῖ ὦμεν, ἂν τε ἐνταῦθα, κατὰ γνώμην αὐτοῦ ζῆν*), not with *φιλοτιμούμεθα* (Calvin : Paul says, “*tam mortuis quam vivis hoc inesse studium*”) ; for they who are at home with Christ *are* well-pleasing to Him, and, according to Rom. vi. 7, Paul cannot say of them that they *strive* to be so. The striving refers merely to the earthly life, and one strives to be well-pleasing to the Lord as *ἐκδημῶν ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ*, not as *ἐνδημῶν πρὸς αὐτόν*. For in the case of those who *ἐνδημοῦσι πρὸς τὸν κύριον*, the continuance of their being well-pleased is a self-

¹ *μᾶλλον* therefore belongs neither to *εὐδοκοῦμεν* nor to *θαρρ.* κ. *εὐδοκ.*, as if Paul would say that he has this courage *still more* than that meant in ver. 6 (Hofmann), but to *ἐκδημηῆσαι . . . κύριον*. We wish that, instead of the present home in the body, etc., *there may rather (potius) set in the being-from-home out of the body and the being-*

at-home with the Lord. This “*rather*” no more yields an awkward idea here (as Hofmann objects) than it does in all other passages where it is said that one wills, ought to do, or does, instead of one thing *rather the other*. Comp. e.g. 1 Cor. v. 2, vi. 7 ; Rom. xiv. 13 ; John iii. 19.

evident moral fact. On this account, and because quite an illogical order of the two clauses would be the result (*et tunc et nunc!*), the whole of Chrysostom's explanation, and even its mode of connection, is erroneous. The right explanation depends on our completing ἐνδημοῦντες by ἐν τῷ σώματι, and ἐκδημοῦντες by ἐκ τοῦ σώματος; for that τὸ σῶμα is still the idea which continues operative from vv. 6, 8, as shown by τὰ διὰ τοῦ σώματος in ver. 10, an expression occasioned by the very reference to the body, which is before the mind in ver. 9. Further, we must clearly maintain that ἐκδημοῦντες, in contrast to ἐνδημοῦντες, does not mean: *migrating*, i.e. dying, but: *peregre absentes*, *being from home* (comp. Soph. Oed. R. 114: θεωρὸς ἐκδημῶν, a pilgrim from home), just as in ver. 6 ἐκδημοῦμεν was *peregre absumus*, and in ver. 8 ἐκδημῆσαι *peregre abesse*.¹ Hence we must reject all explanations which give the meaning: *living or dying* (Calovius, Bengel, Ewald, Osiander, who find the *totality* of life expressed with a bringing into prominence of the last moment of life), or even: "*sive diutius corpori immanendum, sive eo exeundum sit*" (Erasmus, Paraphr., Emmerling), to which Rückert ultimately comes, introducing Paul's alleged illness; while de Wette thinks that Paul includes mention of the departure from life only to show that he is prepared for everything. We should rather keep strictly to the meaning of ἐκδημ., *peregre absentes ex corpore* (comp. Vulgate: *absentes*), and explain it: *We exert ourselves to be well-pleasing to the Lord, whether we (at His Parousia) are still at-home in the body, or are already from-home out of it, consequently, according to the other figure used before, already ἐκδυσάμενοι, i.e. already dead, so that we come to be judged before Him (more precisely: before His judgment-seat, ver. 10), not through the being changed, like the ἐνδημοῦντες, but through the being raised up. It is thus self-evident that εἴτε ἐνδημοῦντες κ.τ.λ. must be attached not to φιλοτιμούμεθα, but to εὐάρεστοι αὐτῷ εἶναι, as was done by Chrysostom, although with an erroneous explanation.*

Ver. 10. Objective motive of this striving. — τοὺς γὰρ πάντας ἡμᾶς] no one excepted. It applies to *all Christians*; comp. Rom. xiv. 10. — δεῖ] a divine appointment, which is not to be evaded. — φανερωθῆναι] This does not imply "the concealment hitherto of the dead" (de Wette), for the living also are judged, but means: *manifestos fieri cum occultis nostris* (Bengel, comp. Beza). Comp. 1 Cor. iv. 5; Rom. ii. 16. Thus it is distinguished from the mere παραστῆναι, iv. 14, Rom. xiv. 10, for which Grotius takes it; and it is arbitrary to declare this distinction unnecessary (Rückert), since that conception corresponds alike with the word (comp. ver. 11) and the fact. Comp. Chrysostom and Theodoret. — κομίσσεται] Moral actions are, according to the idea of adequate requital, conceived as something deposited, which at the last judgment is *carried away*, received, and taken with us, namely, in the equivalent reward and punishment. Comp. Eph. vi. 8; Col.

¹ In this case, however, there is not the contrast: *et nunc et tunc*, in *this* and in *that* life, as Beza, Grotius, and others suppose, connecting it with εὐάρεστοι εἶναι. For with the *present* well-pleasing the *future*

is obvious of *itself*. Grotius felt this, and hence, substituting another meaning in the second clause, he explains it: "*nunc vitam nostram ipsi probando, tunc ab ipso praemium accipiendo.*" See, against this, Calovius.

iii. 25 ; Gal. vi. 7 ; Matt. vi. 20 ; Rev. xiv. 13. — τὰ διὰ τοῦ σώματος] *sc. ὄντα*, *that which is brought about through the body*, that which has been done by means of the activity of the bodily life (τὸ σῶμα as organic instrument of the Ego in its moral activity generally ; hence not : τῆς σαρκός). Comp., on διὰ τοῦ σώματος, expressions like τῶν ἡδονῶν αἱ διὰ τοῦ σώματος εἰσιν, Plat. *Phaedr.* p. 65 A ; αἰσθήσεις αἱ διὰ τοῦ σώματος, *Phaedr.* p. 250 D, *al.* ; Kühner, *ad Xen. Mem.* iv. 5. 3.¹ Instead of Luther's : *in the life of the body* (so also de Wette and many others), *through the life of the body* would be better. There is no reason for taking the διὰ merely of the *state* (iii. 11). The thought of the *resurrection-body*, with which the recompense is to be received (to which view Osiander, following the Fathers and some older commentators, is inclined), is alien to the context (vv. 6, 8, 9) ; besides, merely διὰ τοῦ σώμ. would be used without τὰ. — The πρὸς ᾧ ἔπραξεν contains the standard of righteousness, in accordance with which every one κομίζεται τὰ διὰ τοῦ σώματος : *corresponding to what he has done*. — εἴτε ἀγαθὸν, εἴτε κακόν] *sc. ἔπραξε*. The recompense of the wicked may take place as well by the assigning of a lower degree of the Messianic salvation (1 Cor. iii. 15 ; 2 Cor. ix. 6) as by exclusion from the Messianic kingdom (1 Cor. vi. 9 f. ; Gal. v. 21 ; Eph. v. 5). (Z⁴)

REMARK.—Our passage does not, as Flatt thought, refer to a *special* judgment which awaits every man *immediately after death* (a conception quite foreign to the apostle), but to the *last* judgment conceived as near ; and it results from it that, according to Paul, the atonement made through the death of Jesus, in virtue of which the pre-Christian guilt of those who had become believers was blotted out, does not do away with the requital of the moral relation established in the Christian state. Comp. Rom. xiv. 10, 12 ; 1 Cor. iv. 5. They come in reality not simply *before* the judgment (to receive their graduated reward of grace, as Osiander thinks), but *into* the judgment ; in John iii. 18, the last judgment is not spoken of, and as to 1 Cor. vi. 2 f., see on that passage. Paul, however, does not thereby say that, if the *Christian* has fallen and turns back again to faith, the atonement through Christ does not benefit him ; on the contrary, the μετάνοια of the Christian is a repetition of his passing over to faith, and the effect of the atonement (of the ἰλαστήριον) is repeated, or rather continues for the Christian individual, so that even the Christian sins are blotted out, when one returns from the life of sin into that of faith. But the immoral conduct of Christians, continuing without this μετάνοια, is liable to the punishment of the judgment, because they in such an event have frustrated as to themselves the aim of the plan of redemption. Comp. Weiss, *bibl. Theol.* p. 379. This in opposition to Rückert's opinion, that *Paul knows nothing of a continuing effect of the merit of Christ*. This continuing effect is implied not only in the general Pauline doctrine that eternal life is God's gift of grace (Rom. vi.

¹ The reading τὰ ἴδια τοῦ σώματος (Arm. Vulg. It. Goth. Or. twice, and many Fathers), which Grotius and Mill approved, is to be regarded as a gloss, in which τὰ διὰ was meant to be defined more precisely by τὰ ἴδια. In the Pelagian controversy the ἴδια acquired importance for combating the

doctrine of original sin, because children could not have done any ἴδια peccata, and hence could not be liable to judgment. On the other hand, Augustine, *Ep.* 107, laid stress on the imputation of Adam's sin, according to which it was the moral property even of children.

23), and in the idea of Christ's intercession (Rom. viii. 34 ; comp. Heb. vii. 25, ix. 24 ; 1 John ii. 1, 2), but also in passages like 2 Cor. vii. 10, compared with Rom. v. 9, 10, 17. We may add the apt remark of Lücke on 1 John, p. 147 : "As a single past and concluded fact, it (Christ's atoning work) would be just a mere symbol ; it has full truth only in its continuing efficacy."

Vv. 11–21. Since we thus fear Christ, we persuade men, but we are manifest to God, and, it is to be hoped, also to you (ver. 11,) by which we nevertheless do not wish to praise ourselves, but to give you occasion to boast of us against our opponents (ver. 12). For for this you have cause, whether we may be now mad (as our opponents say) or in possession of reason (ver. 13). Proof of the latter (vv. 14, 15), from which Paul then infers that he no longer knows any one after the flesh, as formerly, when he had so known Christ, and that hence the Christian is a new creature (vv. 16, 17). And this new creation is the work of God (vv. 18, 19), whence results the exalted standpoint of the apostolic preaching, which proclaims reconciliation (vv. 20, 21).

Ver. 11. *ὁν*] in pursuance of what has just been said, that we all before the judgment-seat of Christ, etc., ver. 10. — *τ. φόβον τ. κυρίου*] The genitive is not genitivus *subjecti* (equivalent to *τὸ φοβερὸν τ. κυρ.*), as Emmerling, Flatt, Billroth, Osiander, and others hold, following Chrysostom and most of the older commentators (comp. Lobeck, *Paralip.* p. 513; Klausen, *ad Aesch. Choeph.* 31); for the use of the expression with the genitive taken *objectively* is the *standing and habitual* one in the LXX., the Apocrypha, and the N. T., according to the analogy of *יְהוָה יִרְאֵת* (vii. 1; Eph. v. 21; comp. Acts ix. 31; Rom. iii. 18); and the context does not warrant us in departing from this. Hence : *since we know accordingly the fear of Christ* (as judge); since holy awe before Him is by no means to us a strange and unknown feeling, but, on the contrary, we know how much and in what way He is to be feared. The Vulgate renders rightly : *timorem Domini* ; Beza wrongly ; *terrorem illum Domini, i.e. formidabile illud iudicium.* — *ἀνθρώπους πείθομεν*] *we persuade men, but God* we do not need to persuade, like men; to Him *we are manifest.* The *ἀνθρ. πειθ.* has been interpreted of the *gaining over to Christianity* (Beza, Grotius, Er. Schmid, Calovius, Emmerling, and others) : or of the *apostolic working* in general (Ewald) ; or of the *correction of erroneous and offensive opinions regarding Paul* (Chrysostom, Theodoret, Theophylact) ; or of the *striving to make themselves pleasing to men* (Erasmus, Luther, Elsner, Wolf, Hammond, Flatt, and others ;¹ or of the *persuadere hominibus nostram integritatem* (Estius, Bengel, Semler, Olshausen, de Wette, Osiander, Neander). Billroth also, with quite arbitrary importation of the idea, thinks that *πείθομεν* is meant of *illegitimate, deceitful persuasion* : "I can indeed deceive men, but to God withal I am manifest." Raphel takes it similarly, but with an interrogative turn. But this assumed meaning of *πείθω* must of necessity have been given by the context (which is not the

¹ Luther : "We deal softly with the people, *i.e.* we do not tyrannize over nor drive the people with excommunications and

other wanton injunctions, for we fear God ; but we teach them gently, so that we disgust no one."

case even in Gal. iv. 10) ; and the idea of *being able* would in this view of the meaning be so *essential*, that it could not be conveyed in the mere indicative, which, on the contrary, expresses the actually existing state of things, as well as the following *πεφανερ*. Olshausen erroneously attempts to correct this explanation to the effect of our understanding the expression in reference to the accusations of the opponents : “As our opponents say, we deceitfully persuade men, but before God we are manifest in our purity.” The “as our opponents say” is as arbitrarily invented,¹ as is the conception of deceit in *πείθομεν*. In defining the object of *πείθομεν*, the only course warranted by the context is to go back to the immediately preceding self-witness in ver. 9, *φιλοτιμ. εὐάρεστοι αὐτῷ εἶναι*. (A^b) Of *this* we bring men to the conviction through our teaching and working, not: of the fact, that we *fear the Lord* (Zachariae, Rückert), since *εἰδότες τ. φόβ. τ. κυρ.* is only of the nature of a motive and a subsidiary thought ; hence also not : “*eundem hunc timorem* hominibus suademus” (Cornelius à Lapide, Clericus, and others). Comp. Pelagius : “ut caveant;” and again Hofmann : we convince others of the duty and the right mode of fearing the Lord. After *ἀνθρώπους* there is no omission of *μέν* (Rückert); but the putting of the clause *ἀνθρ. πείθ.* without indicating its relation makes the following contrast appear surprising and thereby rhetorically more emphatic. — *ἐν ταῖς συνειδ. ὑμῶν*] Calvin aptly says : “Conscientia enim longius penetrat, quam carnis iudicium.” In the *syllogism* of the conscience (law of God—act of man—moral judgment on the same) the action of a *third* party is here the minor premiss. The individualizing *plural* of *συνειδ.* is not elsewhere found; yet comp. iv. 2. — *πεφανερῶσθαι*] the *perfect infinitive* after *ἐλπίζω*, which elsewhere in the N. T. has only the aorist infinitive coupled with it, is here logically necessary in the connection. For Paul hopes, *i.e.* holds the opinion under the hope of its being confirmed, that he has become and is manifest in the conscience of the readers (*present of the completed action*). Comp. Hom. II. xv. 110 : *ἦδη γὰρ νῦν ἐλπομ’ Ἀρηί γε πῆμα τετύχθαι*, Od. vi. 297; Eurip. Suppl. 790.

Ver. 12. *Οὐ πάλιν ἑαυτ. συνιστ.*] See on iii. 1. The *ἑαυτούς* (*not again self-praise do we practise*) does not stand in contrast with the *ὑμῖν* following after *διδ.* (Fritzsche, Osiander), because otherwise *ὑμῖν* must have stood immediately after *ἀλλά*. — *ἀλλὰ ἀφορμ. διδόντες κ.τ.λ.*] We should not, with Beza and Flatt, supply *ἐσμέν*, but *λέγομεν ταῦτα*, which flows from the previous *ἑαυτ. συνιστ.* See Matthiae, p. 1534 ; Kühner, II. p. 604 ; Buttmann, *neut. Gr.* p. 336 [E. T. 393]. — *καυχήματος ὑπὲρ ἡμ.*] Here also *καύχημα* is not (comp. Rom. iv. 2 ; 1 Cor. v. 6, ix. 15 f. ; 2 Cor. i. 14) equivalent to *καύχησις* (de Wette and many others), but is *materies gloriandi*. The thought of the apostle is, that he gives the readers occasion for finding matter to make their boast to his advantage (*ὑπέρ*, comp. ix. 3, vii. 4, viii. 24, vii. 14, ix. 2, xii. 5). The whole phrase *ἀλλὰ ἀφορμὴν κ.τ.λ.* combines with all the strength of apostolic self-confidence a tender delicacy, in which, nevertheless, we cannot help seeing a touch of irony (for Paul presents the cold and adverse disposition towards him, into which a part of the church

¹ It is different with *ἐξέστημεν*, ver. 13, where the *literal sense in itself* points to an

accusation of the opponents ; but this is not the case with *πείθομεν*.

had allowed itself to be brought by the hostile teachers, as lack of occasion to make their boast on his account !). — After ἔχητε there is supplied either τί (Acts xxiv. 19) : *in order that you may have somewhat* to oppose to those who, etc. (so Calvin and the most), or τὸ λέγειν (Theodoret, de Wette, Osiander), or καύχημα (rather καύχ. ὑπὲρ ἡμ., for these words go together). So Camerarius, Zeger, and others, including Rückert and Ewald. But since *give* and *have* are evidently correlative, the context leads us (comp. Hofmann also) to supply ἀφορμὴν καυχήματος ὑπὲρ ἡμ. : *in order that ye may have this occasion, have it in readiness* (comp. 1 Cor. xiv. 26) to make use of it, *against those who, etc.* πρὸς, according to the context, denotes the direction *contra*, Matthiae, p. 1390. — πρὸς τοὺς ἐν προσώπῳ καυχ., κ. οὐ καρδίᾳ.] *against those, who make their boast for the sake of countenance and not of heart.* A very striking description of the opponents as *hypocritical* boasters, not of the making a parade of their being immediate disciples of Christ (Hilgenfeld). The object of their self-boasting is the *countenance*, the holiness, the zeal, the love, etc., which present themselves on their countenance, but of the *heart* they make no boast ; for of that of which they boast, their heart is empty.¹ “Ubi autem inanis est ostentatio, illic nulla sinceritas, nulla animi rectitudo,” Calvin. It is self-evident withal to the reader that this whole description is expressed according to the true state of the case, and not according to the design of the persons described themselves ; for these wished, of course, to pass at all events for persons who with their self-boasting exhibited the virtues of their hearts, and not the semblance of their faces. Comp. Theophylact (following Chrysostom) : τοιοῦτοι γὰρ ἦσαν εὐλαβείας μὲν ἔχοντες προσωπεῖον (mask), ἐν δὲ καρδίᾳ οὐδὲν φέροντες ἀγαθόν. Usually (also by Emmerling, Flatt, Schrader, Rückert, Rübiger, Neander) ἐν προσώπῳ is taken in the wider sense: *de rebus externis*, to which is then opposed in καρδίᾳ the purity of the disposition. Learning, eloquence, Jewish lineage, acquaintance with the older apostles, and the like, are held to be included in ἐν προσώπῳ ; comp. Holsten, who recalls the Ἑβραῖοί εἰσιν κ.τ.λ. in xi. 22. But with what warrant from linguistic usage ? Even in passages like 1 Sam. xvi. 17, Matt. xxii. 16, πρόσωπον means nothing else than *countenance*. Paul must have chosen some such contrast as ἐν σαρκὶ καὶ οὐ πνεύματι, in order to be understood. Ewald explains it : “who doubtless *boast me before the face*, when they see myself present, *but not in the heart*.” But καυχωμένους cannot mean : who boast *me*, but only : who boast *themselves*. In the N. T., too, ἐν with καυχᾶσθαι always denotes the *object*,² of which one makes boast,

¹ προσώπῳ, like καρδίᾳ, must refer to *the persons concerned*, and mean *their* countenance (as even Beyschlag grants). Hence it may not be taken, in accordance with Luke xiii. 26, of their having boasted that they had often *seen, heard*, perhaps even *spoken with*, Jesus, while yet they had gained no relation of the heart to him. This in opposition to Beyschlag in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1865, p. 266. For in that case it would, in fact, be the countenance of *Jesus*, which they would make it the contents of their

boast that they had seen, etc.

² In x. 16 the object is denoted by εἰς, whereby the reference to the locality is given for ἐν ἀλλοτρίῳ κανόνι, so that in this passage the construction is not καυχᾶσθαι ἐν, but καυχᾶσθαι εἰς. On καυχᾶσθαι ἐν, comp. the Latin *gloriarī in* ; Cic. *N. D.* iii. 36. 87 ; *Tusc.* i. 21. 49 ; *Catil.* ii. 9. 20. The object is conceived as that, in which the καυχᾶσθαι is causally based. In the classics it is joined with ἐπὶ, εἰς, and with the simple accusative.

even in Jas. iv. 16. Comp. Eccclus. xxxix. 8, l. 20. This, at the same time, in opposition to Hofmann's view : "they make their boast only *in presence of others*, and not *inwardly before themselves*." Neither προσώπῳ (see Winer, p. 116 [E. T. 152]) nor καρδίᾳ (1 Thess. ii. 17 ; Rom. vi. 17, x. 10 ; 2 Cor. ii. 4, *al.*) needed the article ; and there was just as little need for the self-evident αὐτῶν to be inserted (1 Thess. *l.c.*). Indeed, if Paul had meant what Hofmann thinks, he could not but, in order to be intelligible, have added the different genitival definitions (ἄλλων—ἐαυτῶν). Bengel subtly and aptly remarks on καρδίᾳ : "Haec Pauli vena erat : ab ejus corde fulgebat veritas ad conscientias Corinthiorum."

Ver. 13. And you have reason for making your boast on our behalf over against the adversaries !—That Paul is here dealing, and that not without irony, with an odious accusation of his opponents (perhaps of an overseer of the church, according to Ewald), is evident, since otherwise the peculiar mode of expression used by him would appear quite uncalled for. It must have been asserted that he *had gone out of his senses*, that he *had become mad* (observe the *aorist*),—an assertion for which narrow-mindedness as well as malice might find cause enough, or seize pretext, in the extraordinary heroism and divine zeal of his working in general, and especially in his sudden and wonderful conversion, in the ecstasies and visions¹ which he had had, in his anti-Judaism at times unsparing, in his ideal demands on the Christian life, in the prominence given to his consciousness of apostleship, to his sufferings, and the like. In reference to this accusation he now says : "*For be it, that we have become mad* (as our enemies venture to assert), *it is a madness standing at the service of God* (a holy mania, which deserves respect, not blame !) ; *or be it, that we are of sound understanding, we are so for your service* (which can only be found by you praiseworthy)." Comp. Aretius, Rückert, de Wette, Osiander, Hilgenfeld (in his *Zeitschr.* 1864, p. 170), who, however, abides only by the apostle's assertion, that he had seen Christ and was a full apostle, as the ground for this opinion of his opponents. As early as the time of Chrysostom (he quotes an explanation : εἰ μὲν μαίνεσθαι τις ἡμᾶς νομίζει κ.τ.λ.) it was recognized that a hostile accusation was contained in ἐξέστημεν, and this is remarked by most of the older and the modern commentators ; but there should have been the less hesitation at taking the word in its full sense (see on Mark iii. 21 ; comp. Acts xxvi. 24), whereas it was often weakened into : *ultra modum agere*,² or into : *to be foolish* (Chrysostom, Morus, Billroth), *to seem to act foolishly* (Flatt), and the like, in spite of the following σωφρονοῦμεν, which is the exact opposite of having become *mad* (Plato, *Phaedr.* p. 244 A). Comp. Acts xxvi. 25. As regards the *subject-matter*, ἐξέστ. was mostly (as by Chrysostom and Theodoret) referred to the *self-praise*,³ in which case

¹ Grotius limits the reference of ἐξέστ. to the trances alone ; but the word in itself does not justify this.

² So Bengel ; and earlier Luther, who gives as gloss : "If we do too much, *i.e.* if we deal at once sharply with the people, we still serve God by it ; but if we act gen-

tly and moderately with them, we do so for the people's good, so that in every way we do rightly and well."

³ Comp. Pindar, *Ol.* ix. 58 : τὸ καυχᾶσθαι παρὰ καιρὸν μανίαισιν ὑποκρέκει, Plato, *Protag.* p. 323 B : ὁ ἐκεῖ σωφροσύνην ἡγοῦντο εἶναι, τάληθ' ἡ λέγειν, ἐνταῦθα μανίαν.

θεῷ was taken as : *to the honour of God*, and then ὑμῖν was referred either to the salutary *example* (ἵνα μάθῃτε ταπεινοφρονεῖν, Chrysostom, Flatt) or to the salutary *condescension*. So Erasmus,¹ Vatablus, Menochius, Estius, Bengel, Emmerling, Olshausen. Billroth takes it differently : “If, however, you put a rational construction on it (this boasting), in my case, I wish to have myself boasted of only for your advantage ; I do it only in order that *you* may not be deceived by my opponents regarding me.” But the whole reference to the *self-praise* is after ver. 12, where Paul has absolutely negatived the ἐαυτοῦς συνιστάνομεν ὑμῖν, contrary to the context ; and those references of ὑμῖν to the example shown, or to the apostolic condescension, or to a deception of the readers to be prevented, are not in keeping with the parallel θεῷ ; and there is no reason in the context for sacrificing the uniformity in compass of meaning of the two datives, so that ὑμῖν is not to be taken otherwise than with Grotius in the comprehensive sense of *in vestros usus*. According to Hofmann, ἐξέστ. is to be referred to the self-testimony expressed *loftily* and in the *most exalted* tone at ii. 14 ff. : “If it might there be said *that he had gone out of himself*, on the other hand, the succeeding explanation (begun in iii. 1) could only produce the impression of sober rationality.” But in this way there is in fact assumed a retrospective reference for ἐξέστ., which no reader and, excepting Hofmann, no expositor could have conjectured, and this all the less that from iii. 1 to the present passage Paul has been speaking of himself in a tone to a great extent lofty and exalted (*e.g.* iii. 2 f., 12 ff., the whole of chap. iv., particularly after ver. 7 ; also v. 1 ff.) ; so that we do not see on what so great a difference of judgment is to be based, as would be yielded by ἐξέστ. and σωφρον. It remains far from clear, we may add, what more precise conception Hofmann has of “*gone out of himself*” (whether as insanity or merely as extravagance of emotion). — εἴτε . . . εἴτε] does not here mark off two different conditions (Baur in the *theol. Jahrb.* 1850, p. 182 ff.) and times, nor the actual change of moods and modes of behaviour (Osiander) which Paul would scarcely have designated according to different references of aim (comp. rather τὰ πάντα δι’ ὑμᾶς, iv. 15), but two different modes of appearance of the same state, which are both *assumed* as possibly right, but the latter of which is in ver. 14 *proved* to be right and the former excluded.

Ver. 14 f. Paul now *proves* what was implied in ver. 13, that his whole working was done not in his own interest (comp. μηκέτι ἐαυτοῖς, ver. 15), but for God and the brethren ; the love of Christ holds him in bounds, so that he cannot proceed or do otherwise. According to Rückert, Paul wishes to give a reason for the εἰ ἐξέστημεν θεῷ. But he thus arbitrarily overleaps the second half of ver. 13, though this expresses the same thing as the first half. — ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ Χριστοῦ] not : *the love to Christ* (Oecumenius, Beza, Grotius, Mosheim, Heumann, Hofmann, Maier), but : *the love of Christ to men* (so Chrysostom and most others) ; for the death of Christ floating before the

¹ Si quid gloriatur P., id non ad ipsius, sed ad Dei gloriam pertinet ; si mediocria loquitur, id tribuit infirmioribus, quorum affectibus et capacitati se accommodat.”

Rückert also, who in other respects takes ἐξέστ. and σωφρ. rightly in their pure and full sense, refers ὑμῖν to accommodation.

apostle's mind is to him the highest act of love (Rom. v. 6, 7 ; Gal. ii. 20 ; Eph. iii. 19 ; Rom. viii. 35, 37) ; and with Paul generally (not so with John) the genitive of a person with ἀγάπη is always the *genitivus subjecti* (Rom. v. 5, 8, viii. 35, 39 ; 2 Cor. viii. 24, xiii. 13 ; Eph. ii. 4 ; Phil. i. 9 ; also 2 Thess. iii. 5 ; 1 Thess. i. 3 is not here relevant), while, when the person is the object of love, he expresses this by εἰς (Col. i. 4 ; 1 Thess. iii. 12), and denotes by the genitive only an abstract as object (2 Thess. ii. 10) ; in Rom. xv. 30, τοῦ πνεύμ. is the *genitivus originis*. — συνέχει ἡμᾶς] *cohibet nos, holds us in bounds*, so as not to go beyond the limits marked by θεῶ and ὑμῖν, and to follow, possibly, affections and interests of our own. Comp. Calvin (*constringere affectus nostros*), Loesner, Billroth, Hofmann, Castalio : “tenet nos.” Most, however, follow the Vulgate (*urget nos*): *it urges and drives us*.¹ So Emmerling, Vater, Flatt, Schrader, Rückert, Olshausen, Osiander, Neander, and others ; also Chrysostom (οὐκ ἀφίησι ἡσυχάζειν με) and Theodoret (πυρπολούμεθα). But contrary to the usage of the word, for συνέχει always expresses that which *holds together, confines*, and the like, and so may mean *press hard*, but not *urge and drive* (Luke xix. 43, viii. 37, *al.*; Phil. i. 23 ; also Acts xviii. 5). (B⁵) Comp. Plato, *Polit.* p. 311 C ; Pind. *Pyth.* i. 37, *al.*; Philo, *Leg. ad Caj.* p. 1016 E ; also LXX. in Biel and Schleusner, *Thes.* Ewald : *it harasses us*, “so that we have no rest except we do everything in it.” Thus συνέχει would revert to the notion of *pressing hard*, which may be a harassing (Luke xii. 50 ; Wisd. xvii. 11, and Grimm's *Handb. in loc.*). But this is not given here by the context, as, indeed, that further development of the meaning does not flow from the connection. — κρίναντας τοῦτο] *after we have come to be of the judgment*, namely, after our conversion,² Gal. i. 16. This judgment contains that, in consequence of which that restraining influence of the love of Christ takes place—the subjective condition of this influence. — ὅτι εἰς ὑπὲρ πάντων κ.τ.λ.] *that one for all*, etc. Who is meant by εἰς, is clear from ἡ ἀγάπη τ. Χριστοῦ, and was known to all the hearts of the readers ; hence there is the less ground for breaking up the simple sentence, and taking εἰς ὑπὲρ πάντων as in apposition : “*because He, one for all, died*” (Hofmann). As for ὅτι, it is simplest, although εἰ after ὅτι is not genuine (see the critical remarks), to take it, not as *because*, but as *that*, corresponding, according to the usage elsewhere, to the preparatory τοῦτο (Rom. ii. 3, vi. 6 ; 2 Cor. x. 7, 11 ; Eph. v. 5, *al.*) ; in such a way, however, that ἄρα κ.τ.λ. is likewise included in the dependence on ὅτι, and does not form an independent clause (in opposition to Rückert). For the contents of the judgment as such must lie in ἄρα οἱ πάντες ἀπέθανον, of which the historical fact, εἰς ὑπὲρ πάντ. ἀπέθ., is only the actual presupposition serving as its ground. The way in which the two clauses are marshalled side by side (without εἰ or *because*) makes the expression more lively, comp. 1 Cor.

¹ Beza : “totos possidet ac regit, ut ejus afflatu quasi correpti agamus omnia.”

² Not *at*, but *after* conversion. His conversion took place through Christ seizing on him and overmastering him, and not by way of argument ; but subsequently in him who had become a believer there necessa-

rily set in the discursive exercise of reflection, guiding the further judgment regarding the new life which he had acquired. This in opposition to Hofmann's misconception of my explanation, as if I took κρίναντας as identical with the conversion of the apostle.

x. 17. Hence it is to be translated : *that one died for all, consequently they all died, i.e.* consequently in this death of the one the death all was accomplished, the ethical death, namely, in so far as in the case of all the ceasing of the fleshly life, of the life in sin (which ethical dying sets in subjectively through fellowship of faith with the death of Christ), is objectively, as a matter of fact, contained in the death of the Lord. (c⁵) When Christ died the redeeming death for all (comp. v. 21), all died, in respect of their fleshly life, with Him (Χριστῷ συνεσταύρωμαι, Gal. ii. 19 ; ἀπεθάνετε, Col. iii. 3); this *objective* matter of fact which Paul here affirms has its *subjective* realization in the faith of the individuals, through which they have *entered into* that death-fellowship with Christ *given* through His death for all, so that they have now, by means of baptism, become συνταφέντες αὐτῷ (Col. ii. 12). Comp. Rom. vi. 4. Here¹ also, as in all passages where ὑπέρ is used of the atoning death (see on Rom. v. 6 ; Gal. iii. 13), it is not equivalent to ἀντί (comp. on ver. 21), for which it is taken by most commentators, including Flatt, Emmerling, Rückert, Olshausen, de Wette, Usteri, Osiander, Gess, Baur, Maier, but : *for the sake of, all, for their benefit, to expiate their sins* (ver. 19 ; Rom. iii. 25). Since One has died the redeeming death for the good of all, so that the death of this One as ἱλαστήριον has come to benefit all, *all* are dead, because otherwise the εἰς ὑπὲρ πάντων would not be correctly put. The dying of Christ for the reconciliation of *all* necessarily presupposes that death-fellowship of all, for Christ could not have died effectively, *for* one who would not have died *with* Christ ; unbelieving, such a one, in spite of the sacrificial death made for all, would still be in his sins.² That ὑπέρ here *cannot* be equivalent to ἀντί is shown particularly by ver. 15 : τῷ ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν ἀποθανόντι καὶ ἐγερθέντι ; for according to this the resurrection of Jesus also (since it would be quite arbitrary to refer ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν merely to ἀποθανόντι) must have been substitutionary, which is nowhere taught, since it is rather the *actual proof and confirmation* of the atonement (see 1 Cor. xv. 17 ; Rom. iv. 25, ix. 34 ; Acts xiii. 37 f. ; 1 Pet. i. 3 f.). — ὑπὲρ πάντων] *for all men in general*, so that no one is excluded from the effect of his ἱλαστήριον, and every one, so soon as he becomes a believer, attains subjectively to the enjoyment of this effect. This subjective realization, although in the case of those who refuse belief it is frustrated by their guilt, is, in the divine plan of salvation, destined for *all*, and has already taken place in the case of believers ; hence Paul, who himself belonged to the latter, might justly from this his own

¹ Comp. Schweizer in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1858, p. 462 f. ; Hofmann, *Schriftbew.* II. 1, p. 324 f. What Baur remarks, on the other hand, in Hilgenfeld's *Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol.* 1859, p. 241 (comp. his *neut. Theol.* p. 158 f.), that ὑπέρ denotes the *ideal* substitution, *i.e.* the most intimate, immediate entering into the other and putting oneself in his place, is not the contents of the idea of the *preposition*, but that of the *idea of sacrifice*, under which the death of Jesus is ranked, in the consciousness of the apostle and his readers, as an ἱλαστήριον, offered for the

salvation of all (ὑπὲρ πάντων).

² Certainly the dying of Christ was the "close of the previous sin-tainted life of mankind" (Hofmann, comp. Rich. Schmidt, *Paul. Christol.* p. 55 f.), but in so far as this dying blotted out the guilt of mankind. This expiation becomes appropriated by individuals through faith, and out of faith there grows the new life of sanctification, in which he who has died ethically with Christ in faith is ethically risen with Him and lives to God.

standpoint in the οἱ πάντες ἀπέθανον, without meaning by πάντες only *believers* (in opposition to my previous explanation), prove the restraining influence of the love of Christ, which he had himself experienced. — οἱ πάντες] with the article ; for it applies to all those of whom ὑπὲρ π. ἀπέθ. was just said. — ἀπέθανον] not : they *are to die* (Thomas, Grotius, Estius, Nösselt, and others); not : they were *subjected to death* (Chrysostom, Theodoret, Erasmus, Beza, and others ; Vatablus : “morte digni”) ; nor : *they must have died* (Ewald) ; nor : “it is *just as good as if* they had died” (Calovius, Flatt, and others) : but : “*mors facta in morte Christi*” (Bengel), *they died*, which is to be considered as a real fact, objectively contained in the fact of the death of Jesus, and subjectively accomplished in the consciousness of individuals through faith.

Ver. 15. Continuation or second part of the judgment, in consequence of which the love of Christ συνέχει ἡμᾶς. — ὑπὲρ has the emphasis, whereas in ver. 14 the stress lay on εἰς and πάντων. “*And (that) He died for the benefit of all* (with the purpose) *that* (because otherwise this ὑπὲρ would be frustrated) *the living should no more* (as before the death they had died with Christ) *live to themselves, i.e. dedicate their life to selfish ends, but,*” etc. Comp. Rom. xiv. 7 ff. — οἱ ζῶντες] Paul might also have said οἱ πάντες ; but οἱ ζῶντες is purposely chosen with retrospective reference to οἱ πάντες ἀπέθανον, and that as *subject (the living)*, not as *apposition (as the living, Hofmann)*, in which view the life meant is held to be the *earthly* one, which Jesus left when He died ; but this would furnish only a superfluous and unmeaning addition (it is otherwise at iv. 11), and so also with de Wette's interpretation : *so long as we live*. No ; it is *the life*, which has *followed* on the ἀπέθανον. He, namely, who has *died* with Christ is *alive* from death, as Christ Himself has died and become alive (Rom. xiv. 9) ; He who has become σύμφυτος with His *death*, is so also with His *resurrection* (Rom. vi. 5). Thus the dead are necessarily the ζῶντες, by sharing ethically the same fate with Christ, Gal. ii. 19 f. Their ζωή is, consequently, doubtless in substance the life of *regeneration* (Erasmus, Beza, Flatt, and others) ; it is not, however, regarded under this form of conception, but as *καινότης ζωῆς* (Rom. vi. 4), *out of death*. Comp. Rom. vi. 8–11. Rückert, in accordance with his incorrect taking of ὑπὲρ in the sense of ἀντί (see on ver. 14), explains : “those, for whom He has died, on whom, therefore, death has no more claims.” — καὶ ἐγερθέντι] is correlative to the οἱ ζῶντες, in so far as these are just the living out of death, whose life is to belong to the Living One ; and ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν belongs also to ἐγερθ., since Christ is raised διὰ τὴν δικαίωσιν ἡμῶν (Rom. iv. 25). Comp. on Phil. iii. 10 ; 1 Cor. xv. 17.—Note, further, that Paul in ver. 15 writes in the *third* person (he does not say *we*), because he lays down the whole judgment beginning with ὅτι as the great, universally valid and fundamental *doctrine* for the collective Christian life, that he may then in ver. 16 let himself emerge in the ἡμεῖς. He would not have written differently even if he had meant by ἀγάπη τ. Χριστοῦ *his love to the Lord* (in opposition to Hofmann). Much *that is significant* is implied in this doctrinal, objective form of confession.

Ver. 16. Inference from vv. 14 and 15 opposed to the hostile way of

judging of his opponents (comp. ver. 13). Hence it is with us quite otherwise than with our opponents, who judge regarding others *κατὰ σάρκα* : *we know henceforth no one according to flesh-standard*. Since all, namely, have (ethically) died, and every one is destined to live only to Christ, not to himself, our knowing of others must be wholly independent of what they are *κατὰ σάρκα*. Accordingly, the connection of thought between ver. 16 and vv. 14 and 15 demands that we take *κατὰ σάρκα* here not as *subjective* standard of the *οἶδαμεν*, so that we should have to explain it : according to merely human knowledge, without the enlightenment of the Holy Spirit (comp. i. 17 ; 1 Cor. i. 26) : “as one might know Him in a way natural to man” (Hofmann, Osiander, and, earlier, Lyra, Calovius, and others ; comp. also Ernesti, *Urspr. d. Sünde*, I. p. 69), but as *objective* standard (comp. xi. 18 ; John viii. 15 ; Phil. iii. 4), so that *εἰδέναι τινὰ κατὰ σάρκα* means : *to know any one according to merely human appearance*, to know him in such a way, that he is judged by what he is in virtue of his natural, material form of existence, and not by what he is *κατὰ πνεῦμα*, as a Christian, as *καὶνὴ κτίσις* (ver. 17). He who knows no one *κατὰ σάρκα* has entirely left out of account, *e.g.* in the Jew, his Jewish origin ; in the rich man, his riches ; in the scholar, his learning ; in the slave, his bondage ; and so forth (comp. Gal. iii. 28). Comp. Bengel : “secundum carnem : secundum statum veterem ex nobilitate, divitiis, opibus, sapientia.” It is inaccurate to say that this interpretation requires the article before *σάρκα* (Osiander). It *might* be used, but was not *necessary*, any more than at Phil. iii. 3 ff., Rom. i. 3, ix. 5, *al.*, where *σάρξ* everywhere, without the article, denotes the objective relation. — *ἡμεῖς*] *i.e.* *we on our part*, as opposed to the adversaries who judge *κατὰ σάρκα*. The taking the plural as general *embracing others* (Billroth, by way of suggestion, Schenkel, de Wette), has against it the evidently antithetic emphasis of the pronoun ; it is only with the further inference in ver. 17 that the discourse becomes general. — *ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν*] *after the present time, i.e.* after our present (Christian) relation, and with it also the *κρίναντας κ.τ.λ.*, has begun. Paul has *ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν* only here. Beyond this Luke alone in the N. T. has it. — *οἶδαμεν*] not *aestimamus* (Grotius, Estius, and others, including Emmerling and Flatt), but *novimus* ; no one is to us *known κατὰ σάρκα* ; we *know* nothing of him according to such a standard. Comp. on *εἰδέναι οὐδένα* or *οὐδέν* in the sense of complete separation, 1 Cor. ii. 2. *οἶδα* is related to *ἐγνώκα*, *cognovi*, as its lasting *sequel* : *scio*, *quis et qualis sit*. — *εἰ καὶ ἐγνώκαμεν κ. σ. Χριστόν κ.τ.λ.*] apologetic application of the assertion just made, *ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν οὐδένα οἶδαμεν κ. σ.* This remark is added without *δέ* (see the critical remarks), which is accounted for by the impetuous liveliness of the representation. *If even* (as I herewith grant to my opponents, see Hermann, *ad Viger.* p. 832) *the case has occurred that we have known Christ according to flesh-standard, this knowing of Him now exists with us no longer*. The emphasis of this concessive clause lies on the *praeterite* *ἐγνώκαμεν*, which opposes the past to the present relation (*οἶδαμεν*, and see the following *γινώσκομεν*). Therefore *Χριστόν* is not placed immediately after *εἰ καί*, for Paul wishes to express that in the past it has been otherwise than now ; that formerly the *γινώσκειν κ. σάρκα* had certainly occurred in his case, and that in ref-

erence to Christ. This in opposition to the *usual* interpretation, according to which Χριστόν is invested with the chief emphasis. So *e.g.* Billroth : "if we once regarded even Christ Himself in a fleshly manner, if we quite misjudged Him and His kingdom ;" Beyschlag similarly : "even with Christ I make no exception," etc. Rückert, without any reason whatever, conjectures that Paul erroneously inserted Χριστόν, or perhaps did not write it at all. The right interpretation is found in Osiander, Ewald, Kling, also substantially in Hofmann, who, however, would attach εἰ καὶ ἐγνώκαμεν κ.τ.λ. to ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν . . . σάρκα, and thus separate it only by a comma,—a course by which, owing to the following contrast ἀλλὰ κ.τ.λ., the sentence is without sufficient ground made more disjointed.—Paul had known Christ κατὰ σάρκα, so long as the merely human individuality of Christ, His lower, earthly appearance (comp. Chrysostom and Theodoret), was the limit of his knowledge of Him. At the time when he himself was still a zealot against Christ, and His persecutor, he knew Him as a mere man, as a common Jew, not as Messiah, not as the Son of God ; as one justly persecuted and crucified, not as the sinless Reconciler and the transfigured Lord of glory, etc. It was quite different, however, since God had revealed His Son in Paul (Gal. i. 16), whereby he had learned to know Christ according to His true, higher, spiritual nature (κατὰ πνεῦμα, Rom. i. 4).¹ Comp. also Holsten, *z. Ev. d. Paul. und Petr.* p. 429, who, however, refers the Χριστόν, which denotes the entire historical person of the God-man, only to the heavenly, purely pneumatic personality of the Lord, which had been pre-existent and in this sense was re-established by the resurrection. Klöpffer, p. 66, has substantially the right view : the earthly, human appearance of Christ according to its national, legal, and particular limitation. The Judaistic conception of the Messianic idea was the *subjective ground* of the former erroneous knowledge of Christ, but it is not on that account to be explained with many (Luther, see his gloss, Bengel, Rückert, and others) : *according to Jewish ideas of the Messiah* ; for, according to what precedes, κ. σ. must be the *objective* standard of the ἐγνώκαμεν. In that case Χριστόν cannot be *appellative*, the *Messiah* (especially Baur, I. p. 304, ed. 2, and Neander, I. p. 142 f.), but only *nomen proprium*, as the following εἰ τις ἐν Χριστῷ shows. Olshausen, who rightly, as to substance, refers κ. σ. to the life of Christ before His resurrection, deduces, however, from εἰ καὶ ἐγνώκ. that Paul even before his conversion had seen Christ in his visits to Jerusalem, which Beyschlag also, in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1864, p. 248, and 1865, p. 266, gathers from our passage and explains it

¹ According to Estius, the meaning is taken to be : "If we once held it as something great to be fellow-countrymen and kinsmen of Christ." But the words do not convey this. Similarly also Wetstein, who makes the apostle, in opposition to the (alleged) boasting of the false apostles that they were kinsmen and hearers of Christ, maintain, "*cognationem solam nihil prodesse ;*" *et Christum non humilem esse*, as on earth, *sed exaltatum super omnes*. Comp.

Hammond, and also Storr, *Opusc.* II. p. 252, according to whom Paul refers to such, "*qui praeter externa ornamenta et Judaicam originem et pristinam illam suam cum apostolis Christo familiaribus conjunctionem nihil haberent, quo magnifice gloriari possent.*" An allusion to the alleged *spiritualism of the Christine party*, who had reproached the apostle with a fleshly conception of Christ (Schenkel, Goldhorn), is arbitrarily assumed.

accordingly, and Ewald, *Gesch. d. apost. Zeitalt.* p. 368, ed. 3, thinks credible. This is in itself possible (though nowhere testified), but does not follow from our passage ; for ἐγνώκ., in fact, by no means presupposes the *having seen*, but refers to the knowledge of Christ obtained by *colloquial intercourse*, and determined by the Pharisaic fundamental point of view,—a knowledge which Paul before his conversion had derived from his historical acquaintance with Christ's earthly station, influence as a teacher, and fate, as known to all.¹ Besides, the interpretation of a personal acquaintance with Christ would be quite unsuitable to the following ἀλλὰ νῦν κ.τ.λ. It would be *at variance with the context*. See also Klöpper, p. 55 ff. According to de Wette, the sense is : “not yet to have so known Christ as, with a renouncing of one's own fleshly selfishness, to live to Him alone,” ver. 15. But in this way there would result for κατὰ σάρκα the sense of the *subjective* standard (against which see above); further, the signification of κατὰ σ. would not be the same for the two parts of the verse, since in the second part it would affirm *more* (namely, according to fleshly selfishness, *without living to Him alone*); lastly, *this* having known Christ would not suit the time before the conversion of the apostle, to which it nevertheless applies, because at this time he was even *persecutor* of Christ. And this he was, just because he knew him κατὰ σάρκα (taken in *our* sense), which erroneous form of having known ceased only when God ἀπεκάλυψε τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ (Gal. i. 16). While various expositors fail to give to it a clear and definite interpretation,² others have explained it in the linguistically erroneous sense of a merely hypothetical possibility. Thus Erasmus : “Nec est, quod nos posteriores apostolos quisquam hoc nomine minoris faciat, quod Christum mortali corpore in terris versantem non novimus, quando etiam, si contigisset novisse, nunc eam notitiam, quae obstabat spiritui, deposuissimus, et spiritualem factum spiritualiter amaremus ;” so in the main also Grotius, Rosenmüller, Flatt. For a synopsis of the various old explanations, from Faustus the Manichæan (who proved from our passage that Christ had no fleshly body) downward, see Calovius, *Bibl. ill.* p. 463 ff. — ἀλλά] in the apodosis, see on iv. 16. — γινώσκωμεν] *sc.* κατὰ σάρκα Χριστόν.

Ver. 17. Inference from ver. 16. If, namely, the state of matters is such as is stated in ver. 16, that now we no longer know any one as respects his human appearance, and even a knowledge of Christ of that nature, once cherished, no longer exists with us, *it follows* that the adherents of Christ, who are raised above such a knowledge of Christ after a mere sensuous standard, *are quite other than they were before* ; the Christian is *a new creature*, to whom the standard κατὰ σάρκα is no longer suitable. The apostle might have continued with γάρ instead of ὥστε ; in which case he would have *assigned as ground* of the changed knowledge the changed quality of the objects of

¹ Certainly to him also had the cross been a stumbling-block, since, according to the Jewish conception, the Messiah was not to die at all (John xii. 34); but we must not, with Theodoret, limit κατὰ σάρκα to the παθητὸν σῶμα of Christ.

² Hofmann, *e.g.*, describes the knowing of Christ κατὰ σάρκα as of such a nature, that it accommodated itself to the habit of the natural man, and therefore Christ was known only *in so far as He was the object of such knowledge*.

knowledge. He might also, with just as much logical accuracy, infer, from the fact of the knowledge being no longer *κατὰ σάρκα*, that the objects of knowledge could no longer be the old ones, to which the old way of knowing them would still be applicable, but that they must be found in a quality wholly new. He argues not *ex causa*, but *ad causam*. The former he would have done with *γάρ*, the latter he does with *ὥστε* (in opposition to Hofmann's objection). — *ἐν Χριστῷ*] *a Christian*; for through faith Christ is the element *in which* we live and move. — *καινὴ κτίσις*] for the pre-Christian condition, spiritual and moral, is abolished and done away by God through the union of man with Christ (ver. 18; Eph. ii. 10, iv. 21; Col. iii. 9, 10; Rom. vi. 6), and the spiritual nature and life of the believer are constituted quite anew (comp. vv. 14, 15), so that Christ Himself lives in him (Gal. ii. 20) through His Spirit (Rom. viii. 9 f.). See on Gal. vi. 15. The *form* of the expression (its idea is not different from the *παλιγγενεσία*, Tit. iii. 5; John iii. 3; James i. 18) is *Rabbinical*; for the Rabbins also regarded the man converted to Judaism as *בריה חדשה*. See Schoettgen, *Hor.* I. pp. 328, 704 f., and Wetstein. — *τὰ ἀρχαῖα παρῆλθεν κ.τ.λ.*] Epexegetis of *καινὴ κτίσις*; *the old*, the pre-Christian nature and life, the pre-Christian spiritual constitution of man, *is passed away*; *behold the whole*—the whole state of man's personal life—*has become new*.¹ There is too slight a resemblance for us to assume for certain a reminiscence of Isa. xliii. 18 f., or Isa. lxxv. 17; as even Chrysostom and his followers give no hint of such an echo. By the *ἰδοὺ* of vivid realization, and introduced without connecting particle ("demonstrativum rei presentis," Bengel; comp. vi. 9), as well as by the emphatically prefixed *γέγονε* (comp. xii. 11), a certain element of *triumph* is brought into the representation. — The division, according to which the protasis is made to go on to *κτίσις* (Vulgate: "si qua ergo in Christo nova creatura;" or *τίς* is taken as masculine: "si quis ergo mecum est in Christo regeneratus," Cornelius à Lapide), has against it the fact, that in that case the apodosis would contain nothing else than was in the protasis; besides, the prefixing of *ἐν Χ.* would not be adequately accounted for.

Ver. 18. On vv. 18–21, see appropriate remarks in Fritzsche, *ad Rom.* I. p. 279 f. — *τὰ δὲ πάντα*] leading on from the *γέγονε καινὰ τὰ π.* to the supreme source of this change; hence, contextually, *τὰ πάντα* is nothing else than: *the whole that has become new*. Everything, in which the new state of the Christian consists, *proceeds from God*; and now by *τοῦ καταλλάξαντος . . . καταλλαγῆς* is specified *the mode in which* God has set it into operation, namely, by His having reconciled us with Himself through Christ, and entrusted to the apostle and his fellow-labourers the ministry of reconciliation. The reconciliation has taken place *with reference to all humanity* (hence *κόσμον*,

¹ Not only in reference to sin is the old passed away and everything become new (Theodoret: *τὸ τῆς ἁμαρτίας ἀπεκδυσάμεθα γῆρας*), but also—certainly, however, in consequence of the reconciliation appropriated in faith—in relation to the knowledge and consciousness of salvation, as well as to the whole tendency of disposition

and will. Chrysostom and Theophylact unsuitably mix up objective Judaism as also included, and in doing so the latter arbitrarily specializes *τὰ πάντα*: *ἀντὶ τοῦ νόμου εὐαγγέλιον· ἀντὶ Ἱερουσαλὴμ οὐρανός· ἀντὶ ναοῦ τὸ ἐσώτερον τοῦ καταπετάσματος ἐν ᾧ ἡ τριάς· ἀντὶ περιτομῆς βάπτισμα κ.τ.λ.*

ver. 19) ; but Paul uses ἡμᾶς in the person of *believers*, as those who have *experienced* the reconciliation of the world in its subjective realization. This in opposition to Leun, Ewald, Rückert, Hofmann, who refer it to the *apostle* and his fellow-workers, Hofmann, indeed, finding nothing else affirmed than the *conversion*, in so far as it was, “a change of his *relation*, and not of his *conduct*, towards God.” And that ἡμῖν does not apply to men in general (Olshausen), but to *Paul and the rest of the apostolic teachers*, is clear from ἐν ἡμῖν, ver. 19, which is evidently (seeing that Paul has not written ἐν αὐτοῖς) distinguished by a special reference from κόσμος ; besides, the inference, ver. 20, ὑπὲρ Χριστοῦ οὖν πρεσβ., manifestly presupposes the special reference of ἡμῖν and ἐν ἡμῖν in vv. 18, 19. This also in opposition to Höfling. *Kirchenverf.* p. 225, ed. 3. — τοῦ καταλλάξαντος κ.τ.λ.] *who has reconciled us with Himself through Christ.* For men were, by means of their uneffaced sin, burdened with God’s holy wrath, ἐχθροὶ θεοῦ (Rom. v. 10, xi. 28 ; Eph. ii. 16 ; comp. Col. i. 20 f.), *Deo inveni* ; but through God’s causing Christ to die as ἱλαστήριον,¹ He accomplished the effacing of their sins, and by this, therefore, God’s wrath ceased. The same thought is contained in Rom. v. 10, only expressed in a *passive* form. Tittmann’s distinction between διαλλ. and καταλλ. (*Synon.* p. 102) is of no value ; see on Rom. v. 10, and Fritzsche, *ad Rom.* I. p. 276 ff. — τὴν διακον. τῆς καταλλ.] *the ministry, which is devoted to reconciliation*, which is the means of reconciliation for men, inasmuch as through this ministry reconciliation is preached to them, and they are brought unto faith on the ἱλαστήριον Jesus, which faith is the *causa apprehendens* of the reconciliation, Rom. iii. 25 ; comp. διακονία τῆς δικαιοσύνης, iii. 9. The opposite : διακ. τῆς κατακρίσεως, iii. 9.

REMARK.—Rückert erroneously explains the reconciliation from the *active* enmity of men against God. God, according to his view, caused Christ to die for men, that He might, no doubt, on the one hand, be able to accomplish the μὴ λογίζεσθαι of their sins ; but through this manifest proof of His love He filled men with thankfulness, and gave them encouragement to accomplish the reconciliation on their side also, and so (as was Baur’s opinion also) to give up *their* enmity towards God. And thus strictly regarded, the death of Jesus, according to Paul, has not so much reconciled humanity with God, as it has removed the obstacles to the reconciliation, and given a stimulus to the heart to enter into the only right and friendly relation with God.—No, the death of Jesus operated as ἱλαστήριον (Rom. iii. 25 ; Gal. iii. 13), consequently as effacing *God’s* holy enmity (Rom. xi. 28), the ὀργὴ θεοῦ, so that He now did not impute to men their sins (ver. 19), and in *this* way, *actu forensi*, reconciled them with Himself (ver. 21), while simple *faith* is the subjective condition of appropriation on the part of men. Comp. on Col. i. 21. The thankfulness, the new courage, the holy life, etc., are only a *consequence* of the reconciliation appropriated in faith, not a part of it. Comp. Rom. v. 1 ff., vi. 1 ff., viii. 3, 4, *al.* This, at the same time, in opposition to the doctrine of reconciliation set forth by Hofmann (see on Rom. iii. 25), who at our passage calls in question the view that τοῦ καταλλάξαντος κ.τ.λ. expresses an act of God, which takes

¹ i.e. διὰ Χρ. Comp. ver. 21. Pelagius erroneously adds : “ per Christi doctrinam pariter et exemplum.”

place once for all in and with the history of Christ, and defines the notion of καταλλ. (in which ἡμᾶς is held to apply to Paul, in whom God had wrought faith), as amounting to this, that *God through Christ, "whom He Himself gives and ordains for the purpose, makes sin cease for Him to be the cause of wrath against the sinner."* Comp. on the clear and correct notion of reconciliation, according to our passage, Weiss, *bibl. Theol.* p. 325.

Ver. 19. Confirmatory elucidation of the previous ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ, τοῦ καταλλάξαντος . . . καταλλαγῆς. "I have reason for saying, *from God*, who has reconciled us, etc., *because, indeed, God in Christ reconciled the world with Himself*," etc. The recurrence of the same leading *expressions*, which were used in ver. 18, gives to this elucidation a *solemn emphasis*. The θεός emphatically prefixed, however, looking back to ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ in ver. 18, shows that the point is not a description of the καταλλαγή (Camerarius, Wolf, Estius, Billroth, and others), or of the διακονία τῆς καταλλαγῆς (Grotius, Rückert), but the *divine self-activity* in Christ's reconciling work and in the bestowal of the office of reconciliation. The two participial clauses, μὴ λογιζόμενος κ.τ.λ. and καὶ θέμενος κ.τ.λ., stand related to θεὸς ἦν ἐν Χ. κόσμ. καταλλ. ἐαντ. *argumentatively*, so that the words καὶ θέμενος ἐν ἡμῖν κ.τ.λ., which serve to elucidate καὶ δόντος ἡμῖν κ.τ.λ., ver. 18, are not *co-ordinated* to the καταλλάσσων (as one might expect from ver. 18), but are *subordinated* to it,—a change in the form of connecting the conceptions, which cannot surprise us in the case of Paul when we consider his free and lively variety in the mode of linking together his thoughts. — ὥς ὅτι θεὸς ἦν ἐν Χ. κόσμ. καταλλ. ἐαντῷ] *because, indeed, God in Christ was reconciling the world with Himself*. On ὥς ὅτι,¹ *utpote quod* (to be analyzed : *as it is the case, because*), see Winer, p. 574 [E. T. 771]. The ἦν καταλλάσσων should go together (see already Chrysostom), and is more emphatic than the simple imperfect. Paul wishes, namely, to affirm of God, not simply what He *did* (κατέλλασσε), but in what activity He *was*; in the person and work of Christ (ἐν Χριστῷ) *God was in world-reconciling activity*. The imperfect receives from the context the definite temporal reference : *when Christ died the death of reconciliation*, with which took place that very καταλλάξαντος, ver. 18. See, especially, Rom. iii. 24 f., v. 10. Ambrosiaster, Pelagius, Erasmus, Luther, Calvin, Beza, Calovius, Bengel, and many others, including Rückert, Osiander, Neander, connect ἦν ἐν Χριστῷ together : *God was in Christ, while reconciling the world with Himself*. This would only be possible in the event of the two following participial clauses expressing the *mode of reconciliation*, which, however, on account of the second clause (καὶ θέμενος ἐν ἡμῖν κ.τ.λ.), cannot be the case; they must, on the contrary, contain the *confirmation* of θεὸς ἦν ἐν Χ. κόσμ. καταλλ. ἐαντῷ. According to their contents, however, they do not at all confirm the fact that God *was* in Christ, but the fact that God in Christ *was reconciling the world*; hence it is at variance with the context to make

¹ In xi. 21, the ὅτι in ὥς ὅτι does not specify a reason, but introduces the contents of λέγω. In 2 Thess. ii. 2, also, ὥς ὅτι is like *that*. At our passage it is : *in measure of the fact, that God was, etc.*,—a more *circumstan-*

tial and consequently *more emphatic* introduction of the ground than a simple ὅτι or γάρ would have been. It makes us *linger* more over the confirmatory ground assigned.

the connection *ἦν ἐν Χριστῷ*. Theodoret was right in denying expressly this connection. Hofmann, after abandoning his earlier (in the *Schriftbew.* II. 1, p. 326) misinterpretation (see in opposition to it my fourth edition, p. 147), now explains it by referring *ὡς ὅτι κ.τ.λ.* merely to *κ. δόντος ἡμῖν κ.τ.λ.* : *because He was a God, who in Christ was reconciling to Himself a world in its sinful condition without imputation of its sins, and who had laid the word of reconciliation on him the apostle.*" A new misinterpretation. For, first, the qualitative expression "a God," which is held to be predicative, would not only have been quite superfluous (Paul would have had to write merely *ὡς ὅτι ἦν κ.τ.λ.*), but also quite unsuitable, since there is no contrast with other gods; secondly, the relative tense *ἦν* must apply to the time in which what is said in *δόντος ἡμῖν κ.τ.λ.* took place (in the sense, therefore : because he was *at that time* a God, who was reconciling), which would furnish an absurd thought, because, when Paul became an apostle, the reconciliation of the world had been long accomplished : thirdly, *θέμενος* would be a participle logically incorrect, because what it affirms *followed on* the *καταλλάσσω* ; lastly, *μὴ λογιζόμ.* cannot be taken in the sense of "*without imputation,*" since a reconciliation *with* imputation of sins is *unthinkable*. — *κόσμον*] not a world, but *the* world, even without the article (Winer, p. 117 [E. T. 153]), as Gal. vi. 14 ; Rom. iv. 13. It applies to *the whole human race*, not possibly (in opposition to Augustine, Lyra, Beza, Cajetan, Estius) merely to those *predestinated*. The reconciliation of *all men* took place objectively through Christ's death, although the subjective appropriation of it is conditioned by the faith of the individual.¹ — *μὴ λογιζόμενος αὐτοῖς κ.τ.λ.*] *since He does not reckon* (present) *to them their sins, and has deposited* (aorist) *in us the word of reconciliation*. The former is the altered judicial relation, into which God has entered and in which He stands to the sins of men ; the latter is the measure adopted by God, by means of which the former is made known to men. From both it is evident that God in Christ reconciled the world with Himself ; otherwise He would neither have left the sins of men without imputation, nor have imparted to the apostolic teachers the word of reconciliation that they might preach it. If, as is *usually* done, the participial definition *μὴ λογιζόμενος* is taken in the imperfect sense (Ewald takes it rightly in a present sense) as a more precise explanation of the *modus* of the reconciliation, there arises the insoluble difficulty that *θέμενος ἐν ἡμῖν* also would have to be so viewed, and to be taken consequently as an element of the reconciliation, which is impossible, since it expresses what God has done *after* the work of reconciliation, in order to *appropriate* it to men. *θέμενος*, namely, cannot be connected with *θεὸς ἦν*, against which the *aorist* participle is itself decisive ; and it is quite arbitrary to assume (with Billroth and Olshausen) a deviation from the construction, so

¹ The question whether and how Paul regarded the reconciliation of those who died before the *ἱλαστήριον* of Christ, and were not justified like Abraham, remains unanswered, since he nowhere explains himself on the point, and since the dead

are not included in the notion of *κόσμος*. Still, Rom. x. 7, Phil. ii. 10 presuppose the descent of Christ into *Hades*, which is the necessary correlative of the resurrection *ἐκ νεκρῶν*, and it is expressly taught by Paul in Eph. iv. 9.

that Paul should have written ἐθετο instead of θέμενος (comp. Vulgate, Calvin and many others, who translate it without ceremony : *et posuit*). — ἐν ἡμῖν] The doctrine of reconciliation (comp. on the genitive, 1 Cor. i. 18 ; Acts xx. 32) which is to be preached, is regarded as something deposited *in the souls of the preachers* for further communication : “ sicut interpreti committitur quid loqui debeat,” Bengel. Comp. on ἐν ἡμῖν, which is not to be taken as *among us*, the θεῖναι ἐν φρεσί, ἐν θυμῳ, ἐν στήθεσσι.

Ver. 20. *For Christ, therefore, we administer the office of ambassador, just as if God exhorted through us.* This double element of the dignity of the high calling follows from the previous θέμενος ἐν ἡμῖν τ. λόγ. τῆς καταλλ. If, namely, it is the word of *reconciliation* which is committed to us, then in our embassy we conduct *Christ's* cause (ὑπὲρ Χ. πρεσβ.), seeing that the reconciliation has taken place through Christ ; and because *God* has entrusted to us this work, our exhortation is to be regarded as taking place by *God* through us (ὡς τ. θ. παρακαλ. δι' ἡμ.). On ὑπὲρ with πρεσβ. in the sense specified, comp. Eph. vi. 20 and the passages in Wetstein and Kypke. The opposite : πρεσβ. κατὰ τινος, Dem. 400, 12. The *usual* interpretation, *vice et loco Christi*, which is rightly abandoned even by Hofmann, and is defended on the part of Baur by mere subtlety, runs counter to the context ; for this sense must have *followed* (οὖν) from what precedes, which, however, is not the case. If the notion of *representation* were to be inferred from what precedes, it could only furnish us with a ὑπὲρ θεοῦ. — Observe the parallel correlation of *Christ* and *God* in the two parts of the verse. The connecting of ὡς τοῦ θεοῦ παρακ. δι' ἡμ. with δεόμεθα ὑπὲρ Χ. (Hofmann) would only disturb this symmetry without due ground. — δεόμεθα ὑπὲρ Χριστοῦ κ.τ.λ.] specification of the contents of the πρεσβεία, and that in the form of apostolic humility and love : *we pray for Christ*, in His interest, in order that we may not, in your case, miss the aim of His divine work of reconciliation : *be ye reconciled to God* ; do not, by refusing faith, frustrate the work of reconciliation in your case, but through your faith bring about that the objectively accomplished reconciliation may be accomplished subjectively in you. Rückert wrongly holds¹ that the second aorist passive cannot have a passive meaning and signifies only *to reconcile oneself* (see, on the contrary, Rom. v. 10 ; Col. i. 21) ; that Paul demands the putting away of the φρόνημα τῆς σαρκός, and the putting on of the φρόνημα τοῦ πνεύματος ; and that so man reconciles himself with God. In this view, the moral immediate consequence of the appropriation of the reconciliation through faith is confounded with this appropriation itself. The reconciliation is necessarily *passive* ; man cannot reconcile himself, but is able only to become by means of faith a partaker of the reconciliation which has been effected on the divine side ; he can only *become reconciled*, which on his side cannot take place without faith, but is *experienced* in faith. This also in opposition to Hofmann, who says that they are to *make their peace with God*, in which case what the person so summoned has to do is made to consist in this, that he complies with the summons and prays God to extend to him also the effect, which the mediation

¹ See against this, also Weber, *v. Zorne Gottes*, p. 302 f.

constituted by God Himself exercises on the relation of sinful man toward Him. — The *subject* of καταλλάγητε is all those, to whom the loving summons of the gospel goes forth ; consequently those not yet reconciled, *i.e.* the *unbelieving*, who, however, are to be brought, through Christ's ambassadors, to appropriate the reconciliation. The *quotidiana remissio* which is promised to *Christians* (Calvin) is not meant, but the καταλλάγητε is fulfilled by those who, hitherto still standing aloof from the reconciliation, believably accept the λόγος τ. καταλλαγῆς sent to them.¹

Ver. 21. This is not the *other side* of the apostolic preaching (one side of it being the previous prayer), for this must logically have preceded the prayer (in opposition to Hofmann) ; but the *inducing motive*, belonging to the δεόμεθα κ.τ.λ., for *complying with* the καταλλ. τῷ θεῷ, by holding forth what has been done on God's side in order to justify men. This weighty motive emerges without γάρ, and is all the more urgent. — τὸν μὴ γνόντα ἁμαρτ.] description of *sinlessness* (τὸν αὐτοδικαιοσύνην ὄντα, Chrysostom) ; for *sin* had *not become known* experimentally to the moral consciousness of Jesus ; it was to Him, because non-existent in Him, a thing unknown from His own experience. This was the necessary *postulate* for His accomplishing the work of reconciliation. — The μὴ with the participle gives at all events a *subjective* negation ; yet it may be doubtful whether it means the judgment of *God* (Billroth, Osiander, Hofmann, Winer) or that of the *Christian consciousness* (so Fritzsche, *ad Rom.* I. p. 279 : “quem talem virum mente concipimus, qui sceleris notitiam non habuerit”). The former is to be preferred, because it makes the *motive*, which is given in ver. 21, appear stronger. The sinlessness of Jesus was present to the consciousness of *God*, when He made Him to be sin.² Rückert, quite without ground, gives up any explanation of the force of μὴ by erroneously remarking that between the article and the participle μὴ always appears, never οὐ. See *e.g.* from the N. T., Rom. ix. 25 ; Gal. iv. 27 ; 1 Pet. ii. 10 ; Eph. v. 4 ; and from profane authors, Plat. *Rep.* p. 427 E : τὸ οὐχ εὐρημένον, Plut. *de garrul.* p. 98, ed Hutt. : πρὸς τοὺς οὐκ ἀκούοντας, Arist. *Eccl.* 187 : ὁ δ' οὐ λαβών, Lucian, *Charid.* 14 : διηγούμενοι τὰ οὐκ ὄντα, *adv. Ind.* 5, and many other passages. — ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν] *for our benefit* (more precise explanation : ἵνα ἡμεῖς κ.τ.λ.), is emphatically prefixed as that, in which lies mainly the motive for fulfilling the prayer in ver. 20 ; hence also ἡμεῖς is afterwards repeated. Regarding ὑπέρ, which no more means *instead* here than it does in Gal. iii. 13 (in opposition to Osiander, Lipsius, *Rechtfertigungsl.* p. 134, and older commentators), see on Rom. v. 6. The thought of substitution is only introduced by what follows. (E⁵) — ἁμαρτίαν ἐποίησε] *abstractum pro concreto* (comp. λῆρος, ὄλεθρος, and the like in the classic writers, Kühner, II. p. 26), denoting more strongly that which God made Him to be (Dissen, *ad Pind.* pp. 145, 476), and ἐποίησε expresses the *setting up of the state*, in which Christ was actually exhibited by God as the *concretum* of ἁμαρτία, as ἁμαρτωλός, in being subjected by Him to suffer the punishment of death ;³ comp. κατάρα, Gal. iii. 13. Holsten,

¹ Thereby is completed in their case the task of the apostolic ministry, which is contained in the μαθητεύσατε, Matt. xxviii. 19.

² Comp. Rich. Schmidt, *Paulin. Christol.* p. 100.

³ It is to be noted, however, that ἁμαρτίαν,

z. *Evang. d. Paul. u. Petr.* p. 437, thinks of Christ's having with His incarnation received also the principle of sin, although He remained without παράβασις. But this is not contained even in Rom. viii. 3; in the present passage it can only be imported at variance with the words (ἀμ. ἐποίησεν), and the distinction between ἁμαρτία and παράβασις is quite foreign to the passage. Even the view, that the death of Jesus has its significance essentially in the fact that it is a *doing away of the definite fleshly quality* (Rich. Schmidt, *Paulin. Christol.* p. 83 ff.), does not fully meet the *sacrificial* conception of the apostle, which is not to be explained away. For, taking ἁμαρτίαν as *sin-offering* (ἁμαρτ., ἁμαρτ.), with Augustine, Ambrosiaster, Pelagius, Occumenius, Erasmus, Vatablus, Cornelius à Lapide, Piscator, Hammond, Wolf, Michaelis, Rosenmüller, Ewald, and others,¹ there is no sure basis laid even in the language of the LXX. (Lev. vi. 25, 30, v. 9; Num. viii. 8); it is at variance with the constant usage of the N. T., and here, moreover, especially at variance with the previous ἁμαρτ. — γενώμεθα] aorist (see the critical remarks), without reference to the relation of time. The *present* of the *Recepta* would denote that the coming of the ἡμεῖς to be δικαιοσύνη (to be δίκαιοι) still continues with the progress of the conversions to Christ. Comp. Stallbaum, *ad Crit.* p. 43 B: "id, quod propositum fuit, nondum perfectum et transactum est, sed adhuc durare cogitatur;" see also Hermann, *ad Viger.* p. 850. — δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ] i.e. *justified by God*. See on Rom. i. 17. Not *thank-offering* (Michaelis, Schulz); not *an offering* just before God, *well-pleasing to Him*, but as δωρεὰ θεοῦ (Rom. v. 17), the opposite of all ἰδία δικαιοσύνη (Rom. x. 3). They who withstand that apostolic prayer of ver. 20 are then those, who τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ τοῦ θεοῦ οὐχ ὑπετάγησαν, Rom. x. 3.—ἐν αὐτῷ] for *in Christ*, namely, in His death of reconciliation (Rom. iii. 25), as *causa meritoria*, our being made righteous has its originating ground.

just like κατάρα, Gal. iii. 13, necessarily includes in itself the notion of *guilt*; further, that the guilt of which Christ, made to be sin and a curse by God, appears as bearer, was not *His own* (μὴ γνόντα ἁμαρτίαν), and that hence the guilt of *men*, who through His death were to be justified by God, was *transferred* to Him; consequently the justification of men is *imputative*. This at the same time in opposition to Hofmann, *Schriftbew.* II. 1, p. 329, according to whom (comp. his explanation at our passage) Paul is held merely to express that God has allowed sin to realize itself in Christ, *as befalling Him*, while it was not in Him as conduct. Certainly it was not in Him as conduct, but it lay upon Him as *the guilt of men* to be atoned for through His sacrifice, Rom. iii. 25; Col. ii. 14; Heb. ix. 28; 1 Pet. ii. 24; John i. 29, *al.*; for which reason His suffering finds itself scripturally regarded not under the

point of view of *experience befalling Him*, evil, or the like, but only under that of *guilt-atoning and penal suffering*. Comp. 1 John ii. 2.

¹ This interpretation is preferred by Ritschl in the *Jahrb. f. D. Th.* 1863, p. 249. for the special reason that, according to the ordinary interpretation, there is an *incongruity* between the *end aimed at* (actual *righteousness of God*) and the *means* (*appearing as a sinner*). But this difficulty is obviated by observing that Christ is conceived by the apostle as in reality bearer of the divine κατάρα, and His death as *mors vicaria* for the benefit (ὑπέρ) of the sinful men, to be whose ἱλαστήριον He was accordingly made by God a sinner. As the γίνεσθαι δικαιοσύνην θεοῦ took place for men *imputatively*, so also did the ἁμαρτίαν ἐποίησεν αὐτόν take place for Christ *imputatively*. In this lies the congruity.

NOTES BY AMERICAN EDITOR.

(T⁴) *Paul's expectation of living till the Parousia.* Ver. 1.

The strong language of the author on this subject does not appear to be in harmony with the Apostle's own declarations to the elders of Ephesus (Acts xx. 22-24) and again to his friends at Cesarea (ibid. xxi. 13), in both of which he speaks of death as imminent before him, or at least as that which might occur at any moment.

(V⁴) "*A building of God.*" Ver. 1.

That this means the resurrection body, as Meyer says, is the opinion of almost all the recent expositors. Hodge alone adopts the view that the house not made with hands is heaven itself, and argues for it very ably, yet not with success; for if the earthly house is a body, the heavenly house must be one also, and a body which is said to be now in heaven and afterwards to come from heaven can hardly be identical with heaven.

(V⁴) "*Be found naked.*" Ver. 3.

Paul's confident expectation that he would not be found without a body when Christ came is naturally, according to the metaphor of the whole passage, expressed by saying he would not be found *naked*. But the term gets a peculiar propriety from the fact that the Greek writers were accustomed to use this word in describing disembodied spirits. (See Stanley *in loco*.)—"If so be" here is by virtue of the connection equivalent to "seeing that."

(W⁴) "*Not unclothed, but clothed upon.*" Ver. 4.

Stanley gives the sense thus: "The groans which I utter being in the tabernacle of the body, are uttered not so much because of the oppression of this outward frame ('being burdened'), not so much from a wish to be entirely freed from the mortal part of our nature, as from the hope that it will be absorbed into a better life." So Hodge: "It is not mere exemption from the burden of life, its duties, its labors, or its sufferings, which is the object of desire, but to be raised to that higher state of existence in which all that is mortal, earthly, and corrupt about one shall be absorbed in the life of God, the divine and eternal life."

(X⁴) "*Not by sight.*" Ver. 7.

Meyer's criticism is true and his rendering is exact, yet it is very certain that the Common Version (and the Revised) gives the idea the Apostle intended, though not the form in which he expressed it.—"To walk" is = *versari*, "pass our life."

(Y⁴) "*At home with the Lord.*" Ver. 8.

The passage sheds light on a matter of which the Bible says little, the state of the saved between death and resurrection. For Paul evidently thinks of no alternative except to be *at home in the body* and *at home with the Lord*. Therefore departed believers are with Christ; and if so, not unconscious (for the uncon-

scious are practically nowhere) ; and their nearness to Christ is such that compared with it their spiritual presence with Him in this life is absence. And although they have not yet entered their "eternal house" and put on their heavenly clothing, yet in the presence of Christ they are *at home*. And their eternal intercourse with Him has begun. (See Philip. i. 20.) (Beet.)

(z⁴) "*Things done in the body.*" Ver. 10.

"If it is on the deeds *done in the body* that the judgment is to be held, it follows that no change effected after men have left the body will be taken into account in fixing their final state" (Principal Brown). — Meyer's statement that the wicked may be recompensed by a lower degree of the Messianic salvation is wholly unscriptural. The Bible knows of only two classes—the saved and the lost. The former have varying degrees of blessedness, but are all saved. The latter have varying degrees of suffering (many stripes, few stripes, Luke xii. 47, 48), but all are lost.

(A⁵) "*We persuade men.*" Ver. 11.

Waite (Speaker's Comm.) and Alford agree with Meyer in viewing this as meaning Paul's desire to convince men of his integrity (so Hodge apparently). But Plumptre, Beet, Brown, and others take it in the sense of winning men to the Gospel. The former sense is more agreeable to the context and to the antithesis in this verse.

(B⁵) "*Constraineth us.*" Ver. 14.

It is true that the Greek verb does not mean to urge and drive, but it has the sense of pressing hard, as a crowd does (Luke viii. 45) ; and why may not this meaning of a strong outward pressure pass over into an inward impulse, or, as Alford puts it, a forcible compression of energies into one line of action ?

(C⁵) "*Therefore all died.*" Ver. 14.

The simple sense is that the death of one was the death of all. If one died for all, then all died. The Scriptures teach that the relation between Christ and His people is analogous to that between Adam and his posterity (Hodge). This important passage is greatly obscured by a mistranslation in the Authorized Version, corrected in the Revision of 1881. The "all" therefore must refer to believers, and not to the race, as Meyer thinks.

(D⁵) "*Who hath reconciled us unto Himself.*" Ver. 18.

Meyer's exposition of this clause is sound and satisfactory. As Hodge (*in loc.*) says, To *reconcile* is to remove enmity between parties at variance with each other. In this case God is the reconciler. Man never makes reconciliation. It is what he experiences or embraces. The enmity between God and man is removed by the act of God. It is done by the death of Christ, which, however, is represented as a sacrifice ; but the design and nature of a sacrifice are to propitiate and not to reform. In Rom. v. 9, 10, "being reconciled by the death of the Son" is interchanged as equivalent with "being justified by his blood," which proves that the reconciliation intended consists in the satisfac-

tion of divine justice by the sacrifice of Christ. Moreover, here our reconciliation to God is made the source and cause of our new creation, *i.e.* regeneration. God's reconciliation to us must precede our reconciliation to Him.—Weiss, who certainly has no dogmatic bias, says : “The reconciliation cannot consist in this, that man gives up his hostile disposition towards God. It is not something mutual, as if man gives up his enmity and God consequently gives up his *ὀργή*. By not reckoning unto men their trespasses, God gives up His enmity to men, which is, as it were, forced upon Him by the sin which rouses His wrath. It is He alone that changes His hostile disposition into a gracious one, after He has treated the sinless One as a Sinner in behalf of sinners. (Bib. Theol. Part III. chap. vi. note).

(E⁵) “*Made sin for us.*” Ver. 21.

There is probably no one verse in Scripture which states the doctrines of atonement and justification more clearly and concisely than this. Dr. Meyer has treated it carefully and justly.

CHAPTER VI.

Ver. 14. ἡ τίς] Elz. : τίς δέ, against decisive evidence. — Ver. 15. Instead of Χριστῶ, Lachm. and Tisch. have Χριστοῦ, following B C 8, min. Vulg. Copt. Fathers. Rightly; the dative came in from the adjoining words. — Ver. 16. ὑμεῖς . . . ἐστε] Lachm. : ἡμεῖς . . . ἐσμεν, following B D* L 8* min. Copt. Clar. Germ. Clem. Didym. Aug. (once). To be preferred, since the *Recepta* was very naturally suggested as well by the remembrance of 1 Cor. iii. 16 as by the connection (vv. 14, 17), while there was no ground for putting ἡμεῖς . . . ἐσμεν in its stead. — μοι] Lachm. : μου. Attested, no doubt, by B C 8, 17, 37, but easily brought in after αὐτῶν.¹ — Ver. 17. ἐξέλθετε] The form ἐξέλθατε is to be adopted, with Lachm. Tisch. and Rück., following B C F G 8, 71, *al.* Damasc. See Fritzsche, *ad Marc.* p. 639.

After Paul has, in vv. 20, 21, expressed by δεόμεθα κ.τ.λ. the first and most immediate duty of his ministry as ambassador, he now expresses also his further working as a teacher, and that in reference to the readers, vv. 1, 2. And in order to show how important and sacred is this second part of his working as a joint-labourer with Christ, and certainly at the same time by way of an example putting his opponents to shame, he thereupon sets forth (vv. 3–10), in a stream of diction swelling onward with ever increasing grandeur, his own conduct in his hortatory activity. “Maxima est innocentiae contumacia,” Quintil. ii. 4. “Verba innocentī reperire facile est,” Curtius, vi. 10. 37.

Ver. 1. *Connection and meaning* : “We do not, however, let the matter rest merely with that entreaty on Christ’s behalf : *be ye reconciled to God*, but, *since we are His fellow-workers*, and there is thus more laid on us to do than that entreaty on Christ’s behalf, *we also exhort that ye lose not again the grace of God which you have received* (v. 21), that *ye do not frustrate it in your case by an unchristian life*.” — συνεργοῦντες] The συν finds its contextual reference not in the subject of v. 21, where there is only an auxiliary clause assigning a reason, nor yet in ὡς τοῦ θεοῦ παρακαλ. δι’ ἡμῶν, ver. 20, in which there was given only a modal definition of the πρεσβεῖν ὑπὲρ X., but in ὑπὲρ Χριστοῦ, ver. 20 : *as working together with Christ*. It cannot, therefore, apply to *God* (Oecumenius, Lyra, Beza, Calvin, Cajetan, Vorstius, Estius, Grotius, Calovius, and others, including Rückert, de Wette, Osiander, Hofmann, in accordance with 1 Cor. iii. 9), or to the *fellow-apostles* (Heumann, Leun), or to the *Corinthian teachers* (Schulz, Bolten), or to the *Corinthians* in general (Chrysostom, Theodoret, Pelagius, Bengel, Billroth,

¹ In the LXX. also, Lev. xxvi. 22, there occurs for μοι the variation μου.

Olshausen ¹), or to the *exhortations*, with which his own example co-operates (Michaelis, Emmerling, Flatt). The apostles are *fellow-workers* with Christ just in this, that they are ambassadors ὑπὲρ Χριστοῦ, and as such have to represent *His* cause and prosecute *His* work. — μὴ εἰς κενὸν κ.τ.λ.] ἐπάγει ταῦτα τὴν περὶ τὸν βίον σπουδὴν ἀπαιτῶν, Chrysostom. For if he that is reconciled through faith leads an unchristian life, the reconciliation is in his case frustrated. See Rom. vi., viii. 12, 13, *al.* — εἰς κενόν] *incassum*, of *no effect*, Gal. ii. 2 ; Phil. ii. 16 ; 1 Thess. iii. 5 ; Diod. xix. 9 ; Heliod. x. 30 ; Jacobs, *ad Anthol.* VII. p. 328. — δέξασθαι] is to be explained as *recipiatis*. So Vulgate, Luther, and others, including Rückert, Ewald, Osiander, Hofmann. Those, namely, who, like the readers (ὑμᾶς), have become partakers of the reconciliation through compliance with the entreaty in v. 20, are placed now under the divine *grace* (comp. Rom. vi. 14 f.). (F⁵) And this they are not to reject, but *to receive and accept* (δέξασθαι), and that not εἰς κενόν, *i.e.*, not without the corresponding moral results, which would be wanting if one reconciled and justified by faith were not to follow the drawing of grace and the will of the Spirit and to walk in the *καινότης τῆς ζωῆς* (Rom. vi. 4) as a new creature, etc. Comp. Theodoret. Pelagius also is right : “in vacuum gratiam Dei recipit, qui in novo testamento non novus est.” Hence it is not (not even in Rom. xv. 9) to be taken in the sense of the *praeterite*, as many of the more recent commentators (even de Wette) take it, contrary to usage, following Erasmus : “ne committatis, ut, semel gratis a peccatis exempti, in pristinam vitam relabentes in vanum *recepitis* gratiam Dei.” — ὑμᾶς] is now, after the apostolic calling has been expressed at iv. 20 in its *general* bearing, added and placed at the end for emphasis, because now the discourse passes into the direct exhortation to the *readers*, that *they* receive not without effect, etc. If in *their* case that apostolic entreaty for reconciliation had not passed without compliance, *they* are now also to accept and act on the grace under which they have been placed.

Ver. 2 does not assign the reason *why Paul is concerned about his official action*, because, namely, now is the time in which God would have the world helped (Hofmann), but gives, as the context requires by the exhortation brought in at ver. 1, a parenthetic urgent *inducement* for complying with this exhortation *without delay*. — λέγει γάρ] *sc.* ὁ θεός, from what precedes. The passage is Isa. xlix. 8, exactly according to the LXX. The person addressed is the עֲבַד יְהוָה, whose idea is realized in Christ. He is regarded as the head of the true people of God ; *He* is listened to, and *He* is helped, when the grace of God conveyed through Him is not received without result. (G⁵) Such is the *Messianic fulfilment* of that, which in Isaiah is promised to the servant of God regarding the deliverance and salvation of

¹ Billroth says : “he does not simply preach the gospel and leave the Corinthians then to stand alone, but he at the same time busies himself with them for their salvation, inasmuch as he stands by their side with his exhortations as their instructor.” Olshausen : “condescendingly Paul does

not place himself over the Corinthians ; he wishes only to be their fellow-labourer, to exhort them in such wise as they ought to exhort one another.” In that case Paul ought to have written συνεργοῦντες δὲ ὑμῖν, in order to be understood.

the unfortunate people. — *καιρῷ δεκτῷ*] Thus the LXX. translate *בְּצֵן נְעֻץ*, at a time of *favour*. Paul was able to retain the expression of the LXX. all the more, that in the fulfilment of the prophetic word the *acceptableness* (*δεκτῷ*) of the *καιρός* for the people of God consists in this, that it is the point of time for the display of divine favour and grace. Chrysostom well says : *καιρὸς . . . ὁ τῆς δωρεᾶς, ὁ τῆς χάριτος, ὅτε οὐκ ἔστιν εὐθύνας ἀπαιτηθῆναι τῶν ἁμαρτημάτων, οὔτε δίκην δοῦναι, ἀλλὰ μετὰ τῆς ἀπαλλαγῆς καὶ μυρίων ἀπολαῦσαι ἀγαθῶν, δικαιοσύνης, ἀγιασμοῦ, τῶν ἄλλων ἀπάντων*. In substance the same thing is indicated by *ἐν ἡμέρᾳ σωτηρίας*, *on the day of deliverance*. If *καιρὸς δεκτός* is taken as the time pleasing to *God* (Hofmann),¹ it is less in keeping with the parallel “*day of salvation*.” The *aorists* are neither of a *future* (Menochius) nor of a *present* character (Flatt), but the Deity speaking sees the future as having already happened. See on Luke i. 51. — In the commentary which Paul adds : *ἰδοὺ, νῦν κ.τ.λ.*, he discloses the element of that utterance of God, *which moves to the use of this welcome salvation-bringing time*. *Behold, now is the acceptable time; behold, now is the day of deliverance*, which the prophet has foretold ; now or never may you be successful in obtaining salvation through a fruitful acceptance and apprehension of the divine grace ! If the *νῦν* is past, and you have frustrated in your case the grace received, then the hearing and help promised by the prophet are no longer possible ! The duration of this *νῦν* was in Paul's view the brief interval before the near-approaching Parousia. The stronger *εὐπρόσδεκτος* (viii. 12 ; Rom. xv. 16, 31 ; Plut. *Mor.* p. 801 C), which he has used instead of the simple form, has proceeded involuntarily from his deep and earnest feeling on the subject.

Ver. 3. The participle is not connected with ver. 11, but (in opposition to Hofmann, see on ver. 11) with *παρακαλ.* in ver. 1, as a qualitative definition of the subject. Grotius aptly says : “*ostendit enim; quam serio moneat qui ut aliquid proficiat nullis terreatur incommodis, nulla non commoda negligat*.” Luther finds here an *exhortation* (*let us give no one any kind of offence*), which, however, is not allowed either by the construction (*διδόντας* must have been used) or by the contents of what follows. — *ἐν μηδενί*] not *masculine* (Luther) but *neuter* : *in no respect*. Comp. *ἐν παντί*, ver. 4. The *μή* is here used, neither unsuitably to the connection with ver. 1 (Hofmann), nor instead of *ὅν* (Ruckert), but from a subjective point of view : “*we exhort . . . as those, who,*” etc. Comp. 1 Cor. x. 33, and see Winer, p. 451 [E. T. 608]. — *προσκοπή*, only here in the N. T., not found in the LXX. and Apocr. (Polyb. vi. 6. 8, *al.*), is equivalent to *πρόσκομμα, σκάνδαλον*, *i.e. an occasion for unbelief and unchristian conduct*. This is given by a conduct of the *teachers* at variance with the doctrine taught. — *μωμηθῇ*] *be blamed* ; comp. vii. 20. Paul is conscious that he represents the *honour* of the ministry entrusted to him. (11⁵) It cannot be proved that *μωμ.* denotes only *light* blame (Chrysostom and others, Osiander). See even in Homer, *Il.* iii. 412. It depends on the context, as in Pindar, *Pyth.* i. 160 ; Lucian, *Quom. hist.* 33 : *ὁ οὐδεὶς ἂν, ἀλλ' οὐδ' ὁ Μῶμος μωμήσασθαι δύναίτο*.

¹ Comp. Calvin, who understands by it the “*tempus plenitudinis*” of Gal. iv. 4.

Ver. 4. f. *Συννιστῶντες ἑαυτ.*] Here *ἑαυτ.* is not, as in iii. 1, iv. 12, prefixed, because *συννιστ.* is the leading idea. — *ὡς θεοῦ διάκονοι*] different in sense from *ὡς θ. διακόνους* (Vulg. : *ministros*). This would mean : we commend ourselves as those (*accusative*), who appear as God's servants. The former means : *we commend ourselves, as God's servants commend themselves*. Comp. Kühner, § 830, 5. The emphasis is on *θεοῦ*. — *ἐν ὑπομονῇ πολλῇ*] This is the first thing, the *passive* bearing, *through which* that *συννιστ. ἑαυτ. ὡς θ. διάκ.* takes place, *through much patience* ; the further, active side of the *bearing* follows in ver. 6, *ἐν ἀγνότητι κ.τ.λ.*, so that *ἐν θλίψεσιν . . . νηστείαις* is that, *in which* (*ἐν*) the much patience, the much endurance is shown.—Bengel aptly classifies *ἐν θλίψεσιν . . . νηστείαις* : “*Primus ternarius continet genera, secundus species adversorum, tertius spontanea.*” Comp. Theodoret. — *θλίψ.*, *ἀνάγκ.*, *στενοχ.* : *climactic* designation. On *στενοχ.*, comp. iv. 8. It is impracticable, and leads to arbitrariness, to find a climax also in the three points that follow, the more especially as the very first point is worse and more disgraceful than the second. — *ἐν πλῆγμαῖς*] Comp. xi. 23-25 ; Acts xvi. 23. — *ἐν ἀκαταστασίαις*] *in tumults*. Comp. *e.g.* Acts xiii. 50, xiv. 19, xvi. 19 ff., xix. 28 ff. The explanation : *instabilities*, i.e. *banishments from one place to another* (Chrysostom, Theophylact, Oecumenius, Beza, Schulz, Flatt, Olshausen), is in itself possible (comp. *ἀστατοῦμεν* 1 Cor. iv. 11) ; but in the whole of the N. T. *ἀκαταστ.* only means either *confusion, disorder* (1 Cor. xiv. 32 ; 2 Cor. xii. 20 ; Jas. iii. 16), or in a special sense *tumult* (Luke xxi. 9 ; comp. Eccclus. xxvi. 27). See, regarding the latter signification, the profane passages in Wetstein, Schweighäuser, *Lex. Polyb.* p. 17. — *ἐν ἀγρυπν.*] *in sleeplessnesses*, for the sake of working with his hands, teaching, travelling, meditating, praying, through cares, etc. Comp. xi. 27 ; Acts xx. 31. On the *plural*, comp. Herod. iii. 129. — *ἐν κόποις*] is not, with Chrysostom, Theophylact, and others, to be understood only of *labour with the hands* (1 Cor. iv. 11 ; 1 Thess. ii. 9 ; 2 Thess. iii. 8), which limitation is not suggested by the context, but of *toilsome labours in general*, which the conduct of the apostolic ministry entailed. Comp. xi. 23, 27. — *ἐν νηστείαις*] is *generally* explained of the endurance of *hunger and want* (1 Cor. iv. 11 ; Phil. iv. 12). But since *νηστεία* is never used of compulsory fasting, and since Paul himself (xi. 27) distinguishes *ἐν νηστείαις* from *ἐν λιμῷ κ. δίψει*, we must, with Chrysostom, Theodoret, and Calvin (comp. also Osiander, Hofmann), explain it of *voluntary fasting*, which Paul, using with free spirit the time-honoured asceticism, imposed on himself. The objections, that this is at variance with the apostle's spirit, or is here irrelevant, are arbitrary. See Matt. vi. 16, ix. 15, xvii. 21 ; Acts xiv. 23 ; comp. xiii. 2, 3, ix. 9 ; also 1 Cor. vii. 5. (I⁵)

In ver. 6, the series begun with *ἐν ὑπομονῇ πολλῇ* goes further. — *ἐν ἀγνότητι*] *through purity*, moral sincerity in general. Comp. *ἀγνός*, Phil. iv. 8 ; 1 Tim. v. 22 ; 1 John iii. 3. To understand this as meaning *abstinentia a venere* (Grotius and others), or *contempt for money* (Theodoret), is a limitation without ground in the context, and presents too low a moral standard for a servant of God. — *ἐν γνώσει*] Of the high degree of his *evangelical knowledge*, in particular of the moral will of God in the gospel, there is evidence

in every one of his Epistles and in every one of his speeches in the Book of Acts. Calvin and Morus arbitrarily think that what is meant is *recte et scienter agendi peritia*, or (comp. also Rückert and Osiander) true *practical prudence*. — ἐν μακροθυμίᾳ] amid offences. — ἐν χρηστότητι] through kindness (Tittmann, *Synon.* p. 140 ff.). The two are likewise associated in 1 Cor. xiii. 4 ; Gal. v. 22. — ἐν πνεύμ. ἁγίῳ] is not to be limited arbitrarily to the *charismata* (Grotius and others), but : *through the Holy Spirit*, of whom testimony is given by our whole working and conduct just as the fruit of the Spirit (comp. Gal. v. 22) and walk according to the Spirit (Gal. v. 25). The *position* of this and the following point is determined by the circumstance, that Paul, in addition to the points adduced (ἐν ὑπομονῇ . . . ἐν ἀγνότητι κ.τ.λ.), now further mentions their objective divine source, which he bears in himself (ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ), as well as the fundamental virtue of the Christian (ἐν ἀγάπῃ ἀνυποκρ., comp. Rom. xii. 9 ; 1 Pet. i. 22 f., iv. 8), which springs from this source, and without which even those elements already named would fail him (1 Cor. viii. 1, xiii. 1 ff., xiv. 1). In this way he brings to completion that portion of his self-attestation which reaches to this point.

Ver. 7. The enumerations hitherto made related *generally* to the conduct and character of God's servants; now the stream, swelling ever more boldly, passes over to the province of the *teacher's work*, and pours itself forth from ver. 8 in a succession of contrasts between seeming and being, which are so many triumphs of the apostle's clear self-assurance. — ἐν λόγῳ ἀληθ.] *through discourse of truth*, i.e. *through doctrine, the character of which is truth*. Comp. ii. 17, iv. 2. It will not do to take, with Rückert, λόγ. ἀληθ. *objectively*, as equivalent to εὐαγγέλιον, because, as at Eph. i. 13, Col. i. 5, the article could not have been omitted. — ἐν δυνάμει θεοῦ] *through power of God*, which shows itself efficacious in our work of teaching, iv. 7. Comp, 1 Cor. ii. 4, iv. 20. The limitation to the *miracles* is arbitrary (Theophylact, comp. Emmerling and Flatt). — διὰ τῶν ὀπλῶν τῆς δικαιοσ. κ.τ.λ.] is by Grotius connected with what precedes (*Dei virtute nobis arma subministrante*, etc.) ; but seeing that other independent points are afterwards introduced by διὰ, we must suppose that Paul, who elsewhere without any special purpose varies in his use of equivalent prepositions, passes from the instrumental ἐν to the instrumental διὰ, so that we have here also a *special* point : *through the weapons, which righteousness furnishes*. The δικαιοσύνη is to be taken in the usual dogmatic sense. Comp. τὴν θώρακα τῆς δικαιοσ., Eph. vi. 15. It is the *righteousness of faith* which makes us strong and victorious in the way of assault or defence against all opposing powers. See the noble commentary of the apostle himself in Rom. viii. 31–39. It has been explained of *moral integrity* (comp. Rom. vi. 13, 19 ; Eph. v. 9, vi. 14), the genitive being taken either as *ad justitiam implendam* (Grotius), or as *weapons, which the consciousness of integrity gives* (Erasmus, Beza, Calvin, Billroth), or *which are allowed to a moral man and are at his command* (Rückert), or *which minister to that which is of right* (Hofmann), and the like ; but the explanation has this against it, that the context contains absolutely nothing which leads us away from the habitual Pauline conception of δικαιοσύνη, as it was most definitely expressed

even at v. 21, whereas the idea of *δύναμις θεοῦ* stands in quite a Pauline connection with that of *δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ*. See Rom. i. 16, 17. Hence there is no ground for uniting the two conceptions of *δικαιοσύνη* (Osiander), or for explaining it of righteousness as a quality of *God* which works through Paul (Kling). The explanation : *arma justa*, legitimate weapons (Flatt, following Heumann and Morus), is out of the question. — *τῶν δεξιῶν καὶ ἀριστ.*] *right-hand and left-hand arms*, an apportioning specification of the *whole* armament. The former are the *weapons of attack* wielded with the right hand, the latter are the *weapons of defence* (shield) ; the warrior needs both *together*. Hence it was unsuitable to refer the former specially to *res prosperas*, the latter to *res adversas* (Erasmus, Estius, Grotius, Bengel, and others, following the Fathers) : “ne prosperis elevemur, nec frangamur adversis,” Pelagius. Comp. rather, on the subject-matter, x. 4 f.

Ver. 8. It is usually supposed that *διὰ* here is not again instrumental, but *local* : (going) *through honour and shame*, or in the sense of the *accompanying circumstances* (Hofmann) : *amid* honour and shame, we commend ourselves, namely, as God's servants, ver. 4. This is arbitrary on the very face of it ; besides, in this way of taking it there is no *mode* of the apostolic self-commendation at all expressed. Hence Billroth was right in trying to keep to the *instrumental* sense : “*as well honour as shame* (the latter, in so far as he bears it with courage and patience) *must contribute to the apostle's commendation.*” But, on the other hand, it may be urged that, according to the words, it must be the *shame itself* (as also the *δόξα* itself), and not the manner of bearing it, which commends. Hence it is rather to be taken : *through glory*, which we earn for ourselves among the friends of God, and *through dishonour*, which we draw on ourselves among opponents ; through both we commend ourselves as God's servants. On the latter idea (*καὶ ἀτιμίας*), comp. Matt. v. 11 ; Luke vi. 22 ; 1 Pet. iv. 14 ; also Gal. i. 10. In a corresponding way also what follows is to be taken : *through evil report and good report*. — *ὡς πλάνοι κ. ἀληθεῖς*] With this there begins a series of modal definitions, which furnish a triumphant commentary on the two previous statements, *διὰ δόξης κ. ἀτιμίας*, *διὰ δυσφημ. κ. εὐφημ.* In this case the order of the clauses (the injurious aspect being always put first) corresponds to the order of *δυσφ. κ. εὐφημ.* The first clause always gives the *tenor* of the *ἀτιμία* and *δυσφημία* ; the second clause, on the other hand, gives the *actual state of the case*, and consequently also the tenor of the *δόξα* and *εὐφημία*. Hence : *as deceivers and true*, i.e. as people who are both, the former in the opinion and in the mouth of enemies, the latter in point of fact. Accordingly, *καί* is not “*and yet*” (Luther and many others), but the simple *and*. — On the seven times repeated *ὡς*, Valla rightly remarks : “*Paulina oratio sublimis atque urgens.*” Comp. Augustine, *de doct. Christ.* iv. 20. — On *πλάνοι*, which does not mean “*erring*” (Ewald), comp. Matt. xxvii. 63 ; 1 Tim. iv. 1 ; John vii. 12 ; and Wetstein.

Vv. 9, 10. *Ἀγνοούμενοι*] not : *mistaken* or *misjudged* (Flatt, Hofmann, and others), nor yet : people, *for whom nobody cares* (Grotius), but : people, *whom no one is acquainted with* (Gal. i. 22) ; *obscure men*, of whom no one knows anything. Comp. *ἀγνῶς* and the contrasted *γνώριμος*, Plato, Pol. ii.

p. 375 E ; also Demosth. 851. 27. — ἐπιγινώσκ.] *becoming well known* ; comp. on 1 Cor. xiii. 12 ; Matt. xi. 27. By whom ? Rückert thinks : *by God*. But without ground in the text, which rather demands the reference to *men*, as Chrysostom rightly saw : ὡς ἀγν. κ. ἐπιγινώσκ., τοῦτο ἐστὶ διὰ δόξης καὶ ἀτιμίας, τοῖς μὲν γὰρ ἦσαν γνῶριμοι καὶ περισπούδαστοι, οἱ δὲ οὐδὲ εἰδέναι αὐτοὺς ἠξίου. Hence : *as people who are unknown* (viz. according to the contemptuous judgment of opponents), *and well known* (in reality among all true believers). — ἀποθνῄσκοντες] The continual sufferings and deadly perils of the apostle gave to his opponents occasion to say : *he is on the point of death*, he is at his last ! Paul considered himself as *moribundus* (1 Cor. xv. 31), but from what an entirely different point of view ! See 2 Cor. iv. 7–15. — καὶ ἰδοὺ ζῶμεν] *and, behold, we are in life* ! We find a commentary on this in iv. 7 ff. Comp. i. 10. The *construction* often varies so, that after the use of the participle the discourse passes over to the finite verb (Buttmann, *neut. Gram.* p. 327 f. [E. T. 382 f.]) ; but here, in the variation introduced with a lively surprise by ἰδοὺ (comp. v. 17), there is implied a joyful feeling of victory. “Vides non per negligentiam veteres hoc genere uti, sed consulto, ubi quae conjuncta sunt ad vim sententiae simul tamen distinguere volunt paulo expressius,” Dissen, *ad Pind. Isthm.* p. 527. — ὡς παιδευόμενοι κ. μὴ θανατ.] a reminiscence, perhaps, of Ps. cxviii. 18 ; παιδ. is not, however, to be understood of actual chastisements by scourging and the like (Cajetanus, Menochius, Estius, Flatt). This, judged by the analogy of the other clauses, would be too much a matter of detail, and it would be specially inappropriate, because in all the clauses the view of His opponents is placed side by side with the true state of the case. We must rather think of *God* as the παιδεύων. The sorrowful condition of the apostle gave his opponents occasion for concluding : *he is a chastened man* ! a man who is under the divine *chastening rod* ! (J⁵) — καὶ μὴ θανατ.] In his humble piety he does not *deny* that he stands under God's discipline (hence there is here no *opposite* of the first clause) ; but he knows that God's discipline will not proceed to extremity, as His opponents thought ; therefore he adds : *and not becoming killed* ! not sinking under this chastening.—Ver. 10. In the opinion and judgment of our enemies we are people *full of sorrow, poor, and having nothing* (starving and penniless wretches !) ; and in reality we are *at all times rejoicing* (through our Christian frame of mind, comp. Rom. v. 3, and the χαρὰ ἐν πνεύματι ἀγίῳ, Rom. xiv. 17 ; 1 Thess. iv. 6), *enriching many* (with spiritual benefits, 1 Cor. i. 5 ; 2 Cor. viii. 9), and *having in possession everything* (because entrusted with the store of all divine benefits in order to impart them to others). This πάντα κατέχ., like the previous πολλοὺς πλουτίζ., is by Chrysostom, Theodoret, Grotius, Estius, explained in this way, that Paul could have disposed of the property of the Christians, and have enriched many by instituting collections. But such an inferior reference is altogether out of keeping with the lofty tone of the passage, more especially at its close, where it reaches its acme. Comp. also Gemara Nedarim f. 40. 2 : “Recipimus non esse pauperem nisi in scientia. In Occidente seu terra Israel dixerunt : in quo scientia est, is est ut ille, in quo omnia sunt ; in quo illa deest, quid est in eo ?” Rückert's opinion, that in those two clauses Paul was thinking of nothing

definite at all, is unjust towards the apostle. Olshausen, followed by Neander, wishes to find the explanation of πάντα κατέχ. in 1 Cor. iii. 22. But this is less suitable to the πολλοὺς πλουτίζ., evidently referring to the spiritual gifts, to which it is related by way of climax.

Ver. 11–vii. 1. After the episode in vv. 3–10,¹ Paul turns with a conciliatory transition (vv. 11–13) to a special, and for the Corinthians necessary, form of the exhortation expressed in ver. 1 (vv. 14–18). This is followed up in vii. 1 by a general appeal, which embraces the whole moral duty of the Christian.

Ver. 11. *Our mouth stands open towards you, Corinthians ; our heart is enlarged.* — τὸ στόμα ἡμῶν ἀνέωγε] This expression is *in itself* nothing further than a picturesque representation of the thought : *to begin to speak, or to speak.* See, especially, Fritzsche, *Dissert.* II. p. 97, and the remark on Matt. v. 2. A *qualitative* definition may be added simply *through the context*, as is the case also here partly through the general character of the previous passage, vv. 3–10, which is a very open, unreserved utterance, partly by means of the parallel ἡ καρδία ἡμῶν πεπλάτννται. Thus in accordance with the context *the opposite of reserve* is here expressed. Comp. Chrysostom 1. Had Paul merely written λελαλήκαμεν ὑμῖν, the same thought would, in virtue of the context, have been implied in it (we have not been reserved, but have let ourselves be openly heard towards you) ; but the picturesque τὸ στόμα ἡμῶν ἀνέωγε is better fitted to convey this meaning, and is therefore *purposely chosen*. Comp. Ezek. xxxiii. 22 ; Eccclus. xxii. 22 ; Eph. vi. 19 ; Aeschylus, *Prometh.* 612. This at the same time in opposition to Fritzsche, who adheres to the simple *haec ad vos locutus sum*, as to which, we may remark, the *haec* is imported. Rückert (comp. Chrysostom 2) finds the sense to be : “ *see, I have begun to speak with you once, I have not concealed . . . from you my apostolic sentiments ; I cannot yet close my mouth, I must speak with you yet further.*” But the thought : *I must speak with you yet further*, is imported ; how could the reader conjecture it from the simple perfect ? Just as little is it to be assumed, with Hofmann, that Paul wishes only to state that he had not been reserved with what he had to say, so that this expression is only *are sumption* of the παρακαλοῦμεν μὴ εἰς κενὸν κ.τ.λ. in ver. 1. Only in an arbitrary and violent manner can we reject the reference to vv. 3–10, where such a luxuriance of holy *grandiloquentia* has issued from his mouth. — ἀνέωγα, in the sense of ἀνέωγμαi, is frequent in later Greek (in *Il.* xvi. 221, ἀνέωγεν is imperfect), and is rejected by Phrynichus as a solecism. See Lobeck, *ad Phryn.* p. 157 f. — Κορίνθιοι] Regarding this particu-

¹ The supposition that there is an abnormal, and in this respect certainly unexampled construction, under which ver. 11 should be taken as concluding the main clause along with “the preceding long-winded participial clause” (Hofmann), ought to have been precluded by the very consideration that that “long-winded” accumulation of participles, in which, however, Paul paints his whole life active and passive with so much enthusiasm, and, as

it were, triumphant heroism, would stand utterly disproportioned to that which he says in ver. 11, and which is only a brief, gentle, kindly remark. What a magnificent preparation for such a little quiet sentence without substantial contents ! The examples cited by Hofmann from Greek writers and the N. T. (Acts xx. 3 ; Mark ix. 20) are too weak analogies. See regarding similar real anacolutha, Winer, p. 527 f. [E. T. 709 f.]. Comp. on Mark ix. 20.

lar form of address without article or adjective (it is otherwise in Gal. iii. 1) Chrysostom judges rightly : καὶ ἡ προσθήκη δὲ τοῦ ὀνόματος φιλίας πολλῆς καὶ διαθέσεως καὶ θερμότητος, καὶ γὰρ εἰώθαμεν τῶν ἀγαπωμένων συνεχῶς γυμνᾶ τὰ ὀνόματα περιστρέφειν. Comp. Phil. iv. 15. Bengel : “rara et praesentissima appellatio.” — ἡ καρδία ἡμῶν πεπλάτννται] cannot here mean either : *I feel myself cheered and comforted* (comp. Ps. cxix. 32 ; Isa. lx. 5), as Luther, Estius, Kypke, Michaelis, Schleusner, Flatt, Bretschneider, Schrader, and others hold, or : *I have expressed myself frankly*, made a clean breast (Semler, Schulz, Morus, Rosenmüller, de Wette, comp. Beza), because vv. 12 and 13 are against both ways of taking it ; but, with Chrysostom, Theodoret, Occumenius, and the majority, it is to be taken as an expression of the *love* which, by being stirred up and felt, *makes* the heart *wide*, while by the want of love and by hate the heart is narrowed and contracted. The figurative expression needed no elucidation from the Hebrew, and least suitable of all is the comparison with Deut. xi. 16 (Hofmann), where the figurative meaning of פתח is of quite another kind. See, however, the passages in Wetstein on ver. 12. — The two parts of the verse stand side by side as parallels without a connective participle (καί), in order that thus the second thought, which outweighs the first, might come into more prominent relief,—a relation which is indicated by the emphatic prefixing of τὸ στόμα and ἡ καρδία. The meaning accordingly is : *We have* (vv. 3–10) *spoken openly to you, Corinthians ; our heart has therein become right wide in love towards you*—which, however, may not be interpreted of *readiness to receive* the readers (Hofmann), for they *are* already in his heart (vii. 3 ; comp. Phil. i. 7). The relation of the two clauses is taken differently by Emmerling, who inserts a *because* between them, and by Fritzsche, who says : “quod vobis dixi ejusmodi est, ut inde me vos amare appareat.” But it may be urged against both that we are not justified in taking the two perfects as different in temporal import, the one as a real *praeterite*, and the other with the force of a *present*. In πεπλάτννται it is rather implied that Paul has felt his love to the Corinthians strengthened, his heart towards them widened, *during his writing* of the passage vv. 3–10 (by its contents)—a result, after *such* an outpouring, intelligible enough, psychologically true, and turned to account in order to move his readers.

Ver. 12. A negative confirmation of the ἡ καρδία ἡμ. πεπλάτ. just said, an opposite state of matters on the part of the Corinthians. — *Not straitened are ye in us, but straitened in your innermost part*, (σπλ., the seat of love, like καρδία, ver. 11, to which the expression stands related under the increasing emotion by way of climax). The meaning of it is : “*valde vos amo, non item vos me.*” (κ⁶) It is impossible, on account of the οὐ, to take it as an *imperative* (Aretius, Luther, Heumann, Morus, Schleusner). — οὐ στενοχ. ἐν ἡμῖν] *non angusto spatio premimini in animis nostris* : in this Paul retains the figure of the previous ἡ καρδ. ἡμ. πεπλάτ. Chrysostom aptly says : ὁ γὰρ φιλοῦμενος μετὰ πολλῆς ἔνδον ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ τοῦ φιλοῦντος βαδίζει τῆς ἀδείας. Comp. vii. 3 ; Phil. i. 7. The negative expression is an affectionate, pathetic litotes, to be followed by an equally affectionate paternal reproof. This is explanation enough, and dispenses with the hypothesis that Paul is referring to the opinion of the church, that it had too narrow a space—a smaller place

than it wished—in his heart (Hofmann). Those who interpret πλατ., ver. 11, as *to cheer*, take the meaning to be : *not through us do ye become troubled, but through yourselves* (Kypke, Flatt ; comp. Elsner, Estius, Wolf, Zachariae, Schrader ; comp. also Luther),—a thought, however, which is foreign to the whole connection ; hence Flatt also assumes that Paul has vii. 2 ff. already in his thoughts ; and Schrader explains ver. 14–vii. 1 as an interpolation.¹ — στενοχ. δὲ ἐν τ. σπλ. ὑμ.] *so that there is in them no right place for us* (comp. 1 John iii. 17). Chrysostom : οὐκ εἶπεν· οὐ φιλεῖτε ἡμᾶς, ἀλλ' οὐ μετὰ τοῦ αὐτοῦ μέτρον. Paul did not write στενοχωρούμεθα δὲ ἡμεῖς ἐν τοῖς σπλ. ὑμ., because by this the contrast would have passed from the thing to the persons (for he had not, in fact, written οὐχ ὑμεῖς στενοχωρ. ἐν ἡμῖν), and so the passage would have lost in fitting concert and sharp force. Rückert thinks that Paul refers in ver. 12 to an utterance of the Corinthians, who had said : στενοχωρούμεθα ἐν αὐτῷ ! meaning, *we are perplexed at him*, and that now he explains to them how the matter stood with this στενοχωρεῖσθαι, but takes the word in another sense than they themselves had done. A strangely arbitrary view, since the use of the στενοχωρεῖσθαι in our passage was occasioned very naturally and completely by the previous πεπλάτ. Comp. Chrysostom, Theodoret.

Ver. 13. A demand for the opposite of the said στενοχωρεῖσθε ἐν τοῖς σπλ. ὑμ. just said.—The accusative τὴν αὐτὴν ἀντιμισθίαν is not to be supplemented either by *habentes* (Vulgate), nor by *εἰσενέγκατε* (Oecumenius, Theophylact), nor to be connected with λέγω (Chrysostom, Beza, and others) ; it is anacoluthic (accusative absolute), so that it emphatically sets forth an object of discourse, without grammatically attaching to it the further construction. It is otherwise in iii. 18. There is not an *interruption*, but a rhetorical *breaking off* of the construction. These accusatives, otherwise explained by κατά, are therefore the beginning of a construction which is not continued. See Schaefer, *ad Dem.* V. pp. 314, 482 f. ; Matthiae, p. 955. Comp. Bernhardt, p. 132 f. ; Dissen, *ad Pind.* p. 329, *ad Dem. de Cor.* p. 407 ; Winer, p. 576

¹ Emmerling explains this section vi. 14–vii. 1 to be, not an interpolation, but a disturbing addition, only inserted by Paul on reading over the Epistle again, “*sentiis subito in animo exortis.*” And recently Ewald has explained it as an inserted fragment from another Epistle, proceeding probably only from some apostolic man, to a Gentile Christian church. But (1) the apparent want of fitting in to the connection, even if it did exist (but see on ver. 14), would least of all warrant this view in the case of an Epistle written under so lively emotion. (2) The contents are quite Pauline, and sufficiently ingenious. (3) The name βελίαρ, which does not occur elsewhere in Scripture, is not evidence against Paul, since in his Epistles (the Pastoral ones excepted) even the name διάβολος, so current elsewhere, occurs only at two pas-

sages of the Epistle to the Ephesians. Besides, the συμφών. Χριστῷ πρὸς βελίαρ may be an echo of some apocryphal utterance known to the readers (comp. Eph. v. 14). (4) The expressions μετοχή (comp. μετέχειν, 1 Cor. ix. 10, *al.*), μερίς (comp. Col. i. 12), συμφώνησις (comp. σύμφωνος, 1 Cor. vii. 5), καθαρίζω (comp. Eph. v. 26), cannot, any more than συγκατάθεσις which he does not use elsewhere, excite well-grounded suspicion in the case of one so rich in handling the language. (5) The critical evidence gives not the slightest trace of ground for assuming that the section did not originally stand in all the manuscripts. How different it is with passages really interpolated, such as Mark xvi. 9 ff. ; John vii. 33 ff. ! Yet Holsten has also, *zur. Evang. d. Paul. u. Petr.* p. 387, assented to the condemnation of the section.

[E. T. 774]. — αὐτήν] Paul has blended by way of attraction the two conceptions τὸ αὐτό and τὴν ἀντιμισθίαν. See Fritzsche, *Dissert.* II. p. 114 ff. Rückert arbitrarily says : Paul wished to write ὡσαύτως δὲ καὶ ὑμεῖς πλατύνθητε, τὴν ἐμὴν ἀντιμισθίαν, but, by prefixing the latter, he brought the idea of ὡσαύτως also into the first clause, where it necessarily had now to appear as an adjective. He certainly has not only *placed*, but also *thought* τὴν ἀντιμισθίαν first, but at the same time τὸ αὐτό was also in his mind. — The parenthetic ὡς τέκνοις λέγω justifies the expression τὴν αὐτ. ἀντιμισθίαν ; for it is the duty of children to *recompense* a father's love by love in return. Comp. 1 Tim. v. 4. Chrysostom : οὐδὲν μέγα αἰτῶ, εἰ πατὴρ ὢν βούλομαι φιλεῖσθαι παρ' ὑμῶν. The notion of children *yet untrained* (Ewald) would be indicated by something like νηπίοις (1 Cor. iii. 1).

Ver. 14. As a contrast to the desired πλατύν., Paul now forbids their making common cause with the heathen, and so has come to the point of stating what was said generally at ver. 1 (μὴ εἰς κενὸν τ. χ. τ. θεοῦ δέξασθαι) more precisely, in a form needful for the special circumstances of the Corinthians, in order to warn them more urgently and effectually of the danger of losing their salvation. — μὴ γίνεσθε ἑτεροζυγ.] Bengel : “*ne fiat, molliter pro : ne sitis.*” He does not forbid all intercourse with the heathen whatever (see 1 Cor. v. 10, x. 27, vii. 12), but the making common cause with heathen efforts and aims, the entering into the heathen element of life. There is no ground for assuming exclusively special references (such as to sacrificial banquets or to mixed marriages), any more than for excluding such references. — ἑτεροζυγοῦντες] see, in general, Wetstein. It means here : *bearing another* (a different kind of) *yoke*. Comp. ἑτερόζυγος, Lev. xix. 19 ; Schleusner, *Thesaur.* II. p. 557. Paul undoubtedly has in mind the figurative conception of two different animals (as ox and ass) which are yoked together in violation of the law (Deut. xxii. 9),—a conception, in which the heterogeneous fellowship of Christians with heathen is aptly portrayed : *drawing a yoke strange to you*. In this verse the dative ἀπίστοις denotes a fellowship, in which the unbelieving partner *forms the standard which determines* the mode of thought and action of the Christian partner. For this dative cannot mean “*with unbelievers*” (the usual explanation), as if συζυγοῦντες had been used ; but it is not so much *dativus commodi* (Hofmann : *for the pleasure* of unbelievers), a thought which Paul would have doubtless expressed with more precision, as the *dativus ethicus* (Krüger, § 48. 6) ; so that the words mean : do not draw for *unbelievers* a strange yoke. The yoke meant is that drawn by unbelievers, one of a kind strange to Christians (ἑτεροῖον), and the latter are not to *put themselves at the disposal* of unbelievers, by sharing the drawing it. The great *danger* of the relation against which Paul warns them, lies in this dative expression. (L⁵) According to Theophylact (comp. Chrysostom), the sense is : μὴ ἀδικεῖτε τὸ δίκαιον ἐπικλινόμενοι καὶ προσκείμενοι οἷς οὐ θέμις, so that the figurative expression is taken *from the unequal balance* (Phocylides, 13 : σταθμὸν μὴ κρούειν ἑτερόζυγον, ἀλλ' ἴσον ἔλκειν). But apart from the circumstance that Paul would in that case have expressed himself at least very strangely, the reminiscence *from the O. T.*, which the common view assumes, must still be considered as the most natural for the apos-

tle.¹ — τίς γὰρ μετοχὴ κ.τ.λ.] for how utterly incompatible is the Christian with the heathen character ! Observe the impressiveness of the accumulated questions, and of the accumulated contrasts in these questions. The first four questions are joined in two pairs ; the fifth, mounting to the highest designation of Christian holiness, stands alone, and to it are attached, as a forcible conclusion of the discourse, the testimony and injunction of God which confirm it.² — δικαιοσύνη κ. ἀνομία] For the Christian is *justified* by faith (v. 21, vi. 7), and this condition excludes *immoral conduct* (ἀνομία, 1 John iii. 4), which is the element of heathen life (Rom. vi. 19). The two life-elements have nothing in common with each other, Rom. viii. 1 ff. ; Gal. ii. 15 ff.—In the second question the Christian life-element appears as φῶς, and the heathen as σκότος. Comp. Eph. v. 8, 11 f. ; Col. i. 12 f. In the latter is implied ἡ ἄγνοια καὶ ἡ ἁμαρτία, and in φῶς : ἡ γνῶσις καὶ ὁ βίος ὁ ἐνθεός (in both, the intellectual and the ethical element are to be thought of *together*), Gregory Naz. *Or.* 36.—Regarding the two datives, of which the second is expressed in Latin by *cum*, see Matthiae, p. 883 ; and the πρὸς, in the second clause, is the expression of social relation, like our *with*. See Bernhardt, p. 265. Comp. Plato, *Conv.* p. 209 C : κοινωνίαν . . . πρὸς ἀλλήλους, Stobaeus, *S.* 28 : εἰ δέ τις ἐστὶ κοινωνία πρὸς θεοὺς ἡμῖν, Philo. *Leg. ad Cai.* p. 1007 C : τίς οὖν κοινωνία πρὸς Ἀπόλλωνα τῷ μηδὲν οἰκεῖον ἐπιτετηδευκότι, Ecclus. xiii. 2.

Ver. 15. The five different shades given to the notion of *fellowship* vouch for the command which the apostle had over the Greek language. — Regarding the use of δέ before a new question with the same word of interrogation, see Hartung, *Partikell.* I. p. 169. — Βελίαρ] Name of the *devil* (the Peshitto has Satan), properly לְעִלְזָּה (*wickedness*, as concrete equivalent to Πονηρός) ; hence the reading Βελίαλ (Elzevir, Lachmann) is most probably a correction. The form βελίαρ, which also occurs frequently in the *Test. XII. Patr.* (see Fabricius, *Pseudepigr.* V. T. I. pp. 539, 587, 619, *al.*), in Ignatius as interpolated, in the Canon. Ap., and in the Fathers (see Wetstein, critical remarks), is to be explained from the not unfrequent interchange of λ and ρ in the common speech of the Greek Jews. In the O. T. the word does not occur as a *name*. See, generally, Gesenius, *Thesaurus*, I. p. 210. — συμφώνησις, *harmony, accord*, only here in the N. T., not in the LXX. The Greeks say συμφωνία and σύμφωνον (with πρὸς, Polyb. vi. 36. 5 ; Plat. *Lach.* p. 188 D) ; the simple form φώνησις in Pollux ii. 111. — On μερίς, *share*, comp. Acts viii. 21. The two have no partnership with one another, possess nothing in common with one another. The believer has, in Christ, righteousness, peace, etc., all of which the unbeliever has not, and one day will have μερίς τοῦ κλήρου τῶν ἁγίων, Col. i. 12. In strict logic ἡ τίς μερίς . . . ἀπίστου did not belong

¹ Hence our view (comp. Vulgate) is to be preferred also to that of Theodoret : μὴ μιμήσῃσθε τοὺς ἑτέρως ἐννεύοντας βόας καὶ τὸν ζυγὸν κλίνοντας. τὴν τῶν ἀπίστων ἀπάτην τῆς ἡμετέρας προτιμῶντες διδασκαλίας.

² Hofmann brings the second and third questions, as well as the fourth and fifth, into closer relation. Neither the particles ἢ and δέ, nor the prepositions πρὸς and μετά,

nor yet the contents of the questions, are decisive. But it is in favour of our division, which Lachmann has also, that only to the *fifth* question is there specially added the great and important scriptural testimony, vv. 16–18, which is quite in keeping with its *isolated* and *distinctive* position.

to this series of elements of proof, since it contains the proposition itself to be proved, but it has come in amidst the lively, sweeping flow of the discourse.

Ver. 16. Comp. 1 Cor. x. 20. *What agreement* (Polyb. ii. 58. 11, iv. 17. 8) *has the temple of God with idols?* how can it reconcile itself with them? Comp. on συγκατάθ.; also Ex. xxiii. 1; Luke xxiii. 51. (M⁵). The two are contraries, which stand negatively related to one another; if the temple of God should come into contact with idols (as was the case, *e.g.*, under Ahaz), it would be desecrated. — ἡμεῖς γὰρ κ.τ.λ.] With this Paul *proves* that he was not without reason in using the words τίς δὲ συγκατάθεσις ναῶ θεοῦ κ.τ.λ. of the contradiction between the Christian and the heathen character. The emphasis is on ἡμεῖς : *for we Christians are* (sensu mystico) *the temple of the living God.*¹ — ζῶντος] in contrast with the dead idols in the heathen temples. — καθὼς εἶπεν ὁ θεός] *in accordance with the utterance of God*: Lev. xxvi. 12, freely after the LXX., the summary of the divine covenant of promise. — ἐν αὐτοῖς] *among them*; see below, ἐμπεριπατήσω, *walk about in* (Lucian, *adv. Ind.* 6; Ach. Tat. i. 6; LXX.). The *indwelling* of God in the body of Christians as in His temple, and the *intercourse of His gracious rule* in it (ἐμπεριπ.), take place *through the medium of the Spirit*. See on 1 Cor. iii. 16; John xiv. 23.

Ver. 17. With the foregoing quotation Paul now combines another in keeping with his aim (ver. 14), containing the application which God has made of His previous promise. But this quotation is still freer than the one before, after the LXX. Isa. lii. 11, and the last words καὶ γὰρ εἰσδέξομαι ὑμᾶς, are perhaps joined with it through a reminiscence of Ezek. xx. 34 (comp. Ezek. xi. 17; Zech. x. 8). Osiander and most expositors find in καὶ γὰρ εἰσδέξ. ὑμ. a reproduction approximately as to sense of the words in Isa. lii. 12 : καὶ ὁ ἐπισυνάγων ὑμᾶς κύριος ὁ θεὸς Ἰσραὴλ; but this is, at any rate, far-fetched, and, considering Paul's usual freedom in joining different passages of the O. T., unnecessarily harsh. — αὐτῶν] applies to the *heathen*. — ἀκαθάρτου μὴ ἄπτεσθε] Just as ἐξέλθετε κ.τ.λ. had referred (*aorist*) to the separation to be accomplished from the fellowship of a heathen life, so this refers, in the sense of the prophetic fulfilment, to the continuing (*present*) abstinence from all heathen habits (not simply from offerings to idols), and καὶ γὰρ εἰσδέξ. ὑμ. to their reception into *sonship*, see ver. 18. It is correlative to ἐξέλθατε; God wishes to receive those *who have gone forth* into His *paternal house*, *i.e.* into the fellowship of the true theocracy (ver. 18).

Ver. 18. Continuation of the promise begun with καὶ γὰρ εἰσδέξ. ὑμ., and holding forth the holy compensation for the enjoined severance from an unholy intercourse with the heathen. The passage is most probably a free

¹ So according to the reading ἡμεῖς . . . ἐσμεν. See the critical remarks. According to the *Recepta* ὑμεῖς . . . ἐστε (so also Tisch. [but not in his last edition] defended by Rückert, Osiander, Hofmann) it would apply to the *Corinthian church*, which in the spiritual sense is the temple of God, as 1 Cor. iii. 16. Ewald has rightly upheld the

reading ἡμεῖς . . . ἐσμεν, but has wrongly used it against the genuineness of the section (*Jahrb.* IX. p. 216). How often in a connection, where Paul is speaking of *himself* in the first person plural, has he thereupon expressed also in the same person the consciousness of *Christians generally*, as *e.g.* just at v. 21.

and enlarged quotation from 2 Sam. vii. 14. It bears less resemblance to Jer. xxxi. 9, or even to Isa. xliii. 6. And Jer. xxxi. 33, xxxii. 38, are quite out of the question, because there the *sonship* is not mentioned. Cajetanus conjectured that it was from a writing now lost, just as Ewald finds, from *καὶ* onwards, a passage now unknown to us ; according to Grotius, the words are *ex hymno aliquo celebri apud Hebraeos*. The freedom of the N. T. writers in using probative passages from the O. T. renders both hypotheses unnecessary ; of the latter no instance can be shown in Paul, and in itself it is arbitrary. (N⁵) — *κύριος παντοκράτωρ*] “ex hac appellatione perspicitur *magnitudo* promissionum,” Bengel ; rather, on account of the specific contents of *παντοκ.* : the unquestionable *certainly of the fulfilment* (Rom. iv. 21 ; 2 Cor. ix. 8, *al.*), which no power can hinder. Used only here by Paul (often in the Apocal.), who has, however, taken it from 2 Sam. vii. 8, LXX., where *λέγει κυρ. παντοκρ.* introduces the divine utterance.

NOTES BY AMERICAN EDITOR.

(F⁵) “*Receive the grace of God in vain.*” Ver. 1.

Here Dr. Meyer gives the correct idea of “the grace of God” in the text by quoting the words in Romans : “We are not under law, but under grace,” *i.e.*, not under a legal system where salvation is a reward of merit to be earned by good works, but under a gracious system where it is a gratuitous gift of God. What then Paul here cautions the Corinthians against is not receiving the reconciliation and then leading an unchristian life, for there is nothing of this in the context, but it is their rejection of the great salvation. To receive the grace of God in vain is to have the offer of the great blessing contained in the gospel, and then by refusal or neglect to frustrate its end and aim.

(G⁵) *The quotation from Isaiah xlix. 8.* Ver. 2.

These words of Dr. Meyer explain not only the ground of this quotation from the Old Testament, but also the reason of many other citations in the later Scriptures. The “servant of the Lord” in Isaiah means sometimes Messiah the head, and sometimes Israel the body, and thus its various applications are satisfactorily understood.

(H⁵) “*That the ministry be not blamed.*” Ver. 3.

The moral power of a preacher depends almost entirely upon the conviction which his hearers have of his sincerity and the purity of his motives. The lack of this neither learning nor ability can make good (Hodge).

(I⁵) “*Fastings.*” Ver. 5.

Dr. Meyer’s view is confirmed by the fact that the fastings here mentioned fall into the third class as arranged by Bengel : 1. General, *afflictions*, etc. ; 2. Special, *stripes*, etc. ; 3. Voluntary, *labours*, etc.

(J⁵) “*Chastened and not killed.*” Ver. 9.

It is more in consonance with the general strain of the passage to take *chastened* as = afflicted, since there is no reference to any disciplinary design of God in sending the sufferings Paul was called to endure. And this is one of the Scriptures which show that the distresses of believers are not always chastisements, but often sent as opportunities for them to glorify God by their patient endurance and steadfast faith.

(K⁵) “*Not straitened in us,*” etc. Ver. 12.

The simple meaning, without the figure, is, “The want of love is on your side, not on mine.” Accordingly, the following verse means, “Open your hearts to the same love that I show to you, which love is my reward.”

(L⁵) “*Not unequally yoked with unbelievers.*” Ver. 14.

Many suppose that this precept forbids confessors of Christ to marry those who do not confess Him in the use of His sacraments. But it does not mean this. The “unbelievers” it refers to were heathen, but there is no reason to confound with ignorant idolaters persons who have been born in the pale of the church, baptized and religiously educated. It is the union of incongruous, uncongenial elements that is forbidden.

(M⁵) “*The temple of God.*” Ver. 16.

It seems an unhappy nicety in the Revised Version that it puts the word *temple* in both instances of its occurrence in this verse with an indefinite article. One can hardly doubt that the Apostle had in view the one temple; and the omission of the article before a noun followed by a genitive denoting something belonging to the individual, is common. See Rom. i. 2; 1 Cor. ii. 16, and also the original of the phrase “living God” in this verse.

(N⁵) *Paul's method of quoting the O. T.* Ver. 18.

Hodge justly remarks that the N. T. writers often quote according to the sense and not according to the letter; they often blend different passages so as to give the sense, not of one but of several combined; and sometimes they express not the meaning of any passages in particular, but the general sense of Scripture, or what it as a whole certainly teaches. This latter is the case here.

CHAPTER VII.

Ver. 3. For the order *πρὸς κατάκρ. οὐ λέγω* (Lachm.) even the testimony of B C N is not sufficient as against all the vss. and most of the Fathers. — Ver. 8. Instead of the second *εἰ καί*, B has *εἰ δὲ καί*, and the *γάρ* after *βλέπω* is omitted by B D* Clar. Germ. (put in brackets by Lachm.); the Vulgate has read *βλέπων* (without *γάρ*), and Rückert wishes to restore the text accordingly: *εἰ δὲ καὶ μετεμελόμην βλέπων ὅτι . . . ὑμᾶς, νῦν χαίρω*. But the *Recepta* has far preponderant attestation, and the variations are easily explained from it. It was rightly seen that with *εἰ καὶ μετεμ.* there starts a new portion of the discourse (whence in B *δέ* was inserted as an adversative conjunction), and either the apodosis was already begun at *βλέπω*, whence followed the omission of *γάρ*, or it was rightly perceived that the apodosis only began with *νῦν χαίρω*, and so *βλέπων* was substituted as a gloss for *βλέπω γάρ*. — Ver. 10. Instead of the first *κατεργάζεται*, Lachm. Rück. Tisch. have only *ἐργάζεται*, following B C D E N* 37, Justin. Clem. Or. (thrice), Chrys. Dam. Rightly; the compound has crept in on account of the one following (comp. also ver. 11); it is (in opposition to Fritzsche, *de conform.* Lachm. p. 48) too rash to conclude from ver. 11 that Paul wrote *κατεργ.*, for there, after the previous *κατεργ.*, the compound might present itself, naturally and unsought, to the apostle, even if he had used the simple form in the first half of ver 10. — Ver. 11. *ὑμᾶς*] is to be deleted as a supplementary insertion, with Lachm. and Rück., following B C F G N* 17, Boern. Ambrosiast. Aug. — *ἐν τῷ πράγματι*] The *ἐν* is wanting in witnesses of importance; bracketed by Lachm. and Rück.; deleted by Tisch. An explanatory addition to the dative. — Ver. 12. *οὐδέ*] B N** 37, 73 have *ἀλλ' οὐδέ*, an error of the copyist. — *τὴν σπουδὴν ἡμῶν τὴν ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν*] B C D** E K L and many min., also Syr. Arr. Copt. Aeth. Germ. Damasc. Oec. have *τὴν σπ. ὑμῶν*¹ *τ. ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν*. Recommended by Griesb., adopted by Matth. Lachm. and Tisch. Rejected on account of the sense by Rück. and Hofm. But it is precisely the apparent impropriety in the sense of this reading which has given rise to the *Recepta*, just as *πρὸς ὑμᾶς* seemed also unsuitable, and is therefore wanting in Syr. Erp. Arm. Aeth. Vulg. Ambrosiast. Pel. Lachmann's reading appears, therefore, to be the correct one; it is defended also by Reiche, *Comm. crit.* I. p. 367. — Ver. 13. *παρακεκλήμεθα ἐπὶ τῇ παρακλήσει ὑμῶν· περισσοτέρως δὲ μᾶλλον*] Lachm. Tisch. and Rück. read: *παρακεκλήμεθα· ἐπὶ δὲ τῇ παρακλήσει ἡμῶν περισσ. μᾶλλον*, according to considerably preponderating attestation. Rightly; the *ἐπί*, twice taken in the same sense, caused *ἐπὶ τῇ παρακλ. ἡμῶν* to be attached to *παρακεκλήμεθα*, and hence the position of *δέ* to be changed; and now the sense further demanded the change of *ἡμῶν* into *ὑμῶν*. The *Recepta* is defended by Reiche. — Ver. 14. *ἡ καύχησις ἡμῶν ἢ ἐπὶ T.*] *ὑμῶν* for *ἡμῶν* (Lachm.) is supported only by B F, with some vss. and Theoph. A mechanical repetition of *ὑμῶν*

¹ So also N, which, however, has *ὑμῶν* again instead of *ἡμῶν*, obviously through a copyist's error, which is also found in D* F.

from what precedes. — Ver. 16. The οὖν (Elz.) after χαίρω is deleted, as a connective addition, by Griesb. and the later editors on decisive evidence.

Ver. 1 closes the previous section. — *Since we accordingly* (according to vi. 16–18) *have these promises* (namely, that God will dwell among us, receive us, be our Father, etc.), we wish not to make them null in our case by an immoral life. — ταύτας] placed at the head, bears the emphasis of the *importance* of the promises. — καθαρίσωμεν ἑαυτούς] denotes the *morally purifying activity*, which the Christian has to exert on himself, not simply the *keeping* himself pure (Olshausen). He who has become a Christian has by his faith doubtless attained forgiveness of his previous sins (Rom. iii. 23–25), is reconciled with God and sanctified (comp. v. 19 ff., and see on Acts xv. 9); but Paul refers here to the moral stains incurred in the *Christian condition*, which the state of grace of the regenerate (1 Pet. i. 22 f.) as much obliges him to do away with again in reference to himself (Rom. vi. 1 ff., viii. 12 ff.), as by the power of God (Phil. ii. 12, 13) it makes him capable of doing so (Rom. vi. 14, viii. 9). And no one forms an exception in this respect; hence Paul includes himself, with true moral feeling of this need placing himself on an equality with his readers. — σαρκὸς καὶ πνεύματος] The Christian is in the *flesh*, i.e. in the material-psychical part of his nature, stained by fornication, intemperance, and such transgressions and vices as directly pollute the body (which ought to be holy, 1 Cor. vi. 13 ff., vii. 34); and his *spirit*, i.e. the substratum of his rational and moral consciousness, the seat of the operation of the Divine Spirit in him and therewith the bearer of his higher and eternal life (1 Cor. ii. 11, v. 3; Rom. viii. 16), is stained by immoral thoughts, desires, etc., which are suggested to him by means of the power of sin in the flesh, and through which the spirit along with the νοῦς is sinfully affected, becomes weak and bound, and enslaved to sin (comp. on Rom. xii. 2; Eph. iv. 23). The two do not *exclude*, but *include* each other. Observe, further, that Paul might have used σώματος instead of σαρκός; but he puts σαρκός, because the flesh, in which the principle of sin has its seat and hence the *fomes peccati* lies, serves as the element to which every bodily defilement ethically attaches itself. This is based on the natural relation of the σὰρξ to the power of sin, for which reason it is never demanded that the σὰρξ shall be or become holy, but that the *body* (1 Cor. vii. 34) shall be holy through the crucifixion of the flesh, through putting off the old man, etc. (Col. ii. 11). By these means the Christian no longer lives ἐν σαρκί (Rom. viii. 8 f.) and κατὰ σάρκα, and is purified from everything wherewith the flesh is *soiled*; comp. 1 Thess. v. 23; Rom. viii. 13, xii. 1. The surprising character of the expression, to which Holsten especially takes objection (see *z. Evang. d. Paul. u. Petr.* p. 387), is disposed of by the very consideration that Paul is speaking of the *regenerate*; in their case the *lusts* of the σὰρξ in fact remain, and the σὰρξ is *defiled*, if their lusts are actually gratified. Calovius, we may add, rightly observes: “ex illatione etiam apostolica a promissionibus gratiae ad studium novae obedientiae manifestum est, doctrinam apostolicam de gratuita nostri justificatione et in filios adoptione non labefactare pietatis et sanctitatis studium,

sed ad illud excitare atque ad obedientiam Deo praestandam calcar addere.” — On *μολυσμός*, comp. Jer. xxiii. 15 ; 3 Esdr. viii. 83 ; 2 Macc. v. 27 ; Plut. *Mor.* p. 779 C. — *ἐπιτελοῦντες ἁγιωσύνην*] This is the positive activity of the *καθαρίζειν ἑαυτούς* : *while we bring holiness to perfection* (viii. 6) *in the fear of God*. To establish complete holiness in himself is the continual moral endeavour¹ and work of the Christian purifying himself. Comp. Rom. vi. 22. — *ἐν φόβῳ θεοῦ*] is the ethical, holy sphere (Eph. v. 21) in which the *ἐπιτελεῖν ἁγίως*. must move and proceed. (o⁵) Comp. Rom. xi. 19–22, and already Gen. xvii. 1. Thus the apostle closes the whole section with the same ethical fundamental idea, with which he had begun it at ch. v. 11, where, however, it was specifically limited to the executor of the divine judgment.

Vv. 2–16. Regarding the impression made by the former Epistle and its result. A conciliatory outpouring of love and confidence serves as introduction, vv. 2–4. Then an account how Paul received through Titus the comforting and cheering news of the impression made by his Epistle, vv. 5–7. True, he had saddened the readers by his Epistle, but he regrets it no longer, but rejoices now on account of the nature and effect of this saddening, vv. 8–12. Therefore he is calmed, and his joy is still more heightened by the joy of Titus, who has returned so much cheered that Paul saw all his boasts to Titus regarding them justified. He is glad to be of good courage in everything through them, vv. 13–16.

Ver. 2. Having finished his exhortation, vi. 14–vii. 1, he now repeats the same request with which in vi. 13 he had introduced that exhortation (*πλατύνθητε ὑμεῖς*), using the corresponding expression *χωρήσατε ἡμᾶς* : *take us, i.e. receive us, give us room in your heart* (comp. Mark ii. 2 ; John ii. 6, xxi. 25 ; 4 Macc. vii. 6 ; Herod. iv. 61 ; Thuc. ii. 17. 3 ; Eurip. *Hipp.* 941), and then adds at once (without the medium of a *γάρ*) in lively emotion the reason why they had no cause whatever to refuse him this request (*στενοχωρεῖσθαι ἐν τοῖς σπλάγχνοις*, comp. vi. 12). Chrysostom rightly as to substance explains the figurative *χωρήσατε* by *φιλήσατε* ; and Theophylact : *δέξασθε ἡμᾶς πλατέως, καὶ μὴ στενοχωρώμεθα ἐν ὑμῖν*. Comp. Theodoret. So also most of the later commentators, though the meaning was often limited in an arbitrary way (comp. Rosenmüller, Stolz, Flatt, and Pelagius), *e.g.* : *give ear to us*, and the like. Others take it : *understand us rightly* (Bengel, Storr, Bretschneider, Rückert, de Wette). Unobjectionable from a linguistic point of view (see Wetstein, *ad Matt.* xix. 11) ; but in the exhortation of ver. 1 there was nothing to be misunderstood, just as little as for the readers in the disclosure that follows (to which de Wette refers it) ; and if Paul, as Rückert thinks, had had it in his mind that the directions of his first Epistle had been judged unfavourably, he could not have expected any reader to gather this from the simple *χωρήσατε ἡμᾶς*, especially as in what

¹ Although with this the moral perfection itself, which the ideal injunction of it requires, is never fully reached. It is “*non viae, sed metae et patriae*” (Calovius) ; but the Christian labours constantly at it,

striving towards the goal at which “*finis coronat opus*.” Comp. Bengel. The success is of *God* (Phil. i. 6), the fear of whom guides the Christian.

follows the idea of the effects of the first Epistle is quite kept at a distance by οὐδένα ἐπλεονεκτήσαμεν.¹ — οὐδένα ἡδικήσαμεν κ.τ.λ.] This is no doubt aimed at hostile calumniations of the apostle and his companions. Some one must have said : *They act wrongly towards the people! they ruin them, they enrich themselves from them!* It is impossible to prove that ἐφθείραμεν applies exactly to the corruptela quae fit per falsam doctrinam (Calvin and most, following the Fathers ; just as Hofmann also refers it to the inward injuring of the persons themselves, 1 Cor. iii. 17) ; the way in which the word is associated with ἡδικήσ. and ἐπλεονεκτ. is rather in favour of a reference to the outward position. In how many ways not known to us more precisely may the apostle and his fellow-labourers have been accused of such a ruining of others ! How easily might such slanders be based on the strictness of his moral requirements, his sternness in punishing, his zeal for collections, his lodging with members of the church, the readiness to make sacrifices which he demanded, and the like ! Probably his prosecution and administration of the collections would be especially blackened by this reproach of πλεονεκτεῖν. Comp. xii. 17, 18. Rückert refers all three words to the contents of the former Epistle : “with what I wrote you, I have done no one wrong,” etc. ; so that ἡδικ. would refer to the severe punishment of the incestuous person, ἐφθείρ. to his delivery over to Satan, and ἐπλεονεκτ. to the control which Paul by this discipline seemed desirous to exercise over the transgressor and over the church. But if his readers were to know of this reference to his former Epistle, he must have expressed it (the reader could not guess it). Besides, the word ἐπλεονεκτ. is against this view, for in the N. T. it denotes overreaching for one's own benefit as an act of covetousness properly so called, provided the context (as in ii. 11, by ὑπὸ τοῦ Σατανᾶ) does not furnish a more general reference. And, moreover, those acts of discipline, to which Paul is supposed to refer, were acts so completely personal on the part of the apostle, that the plural expression in our passage would be quite unsuitable. — οὐδένα] in the consciousness of innocence is with great emphasis prefixed three times ; but we cannot, with Rückert, infer from this that the incestuous person is concealed under it. Comp. πάντες and πάντα, 1 Cor. xii. 29, xiii. 7 ; Buttm. neut. Gram. p. 341 [E. T. 398].

Ver. 3. *Not for the sake of condemning do I say it*, namely, what was said in ver. 2. I do not wish thereby to express any condemnatory judgment, as if, although we have done wrong to no one, etc., you failed in that love to which χωρήσατε ἡμᾶς lays claim. Κατάκρισιν was taken of the reproach of covetousness (so Theodoret, and comp. Emmerling and Neander), but this is an arbitrary importation into the word. According to Rückert, πρὸς κατάκρισιν is not to be supplemented by ὑμῶν, but Paul wishes here to remove the unpleasant impression of ver. 2, in which he confirms the severity of his former Epistle, so that there is to be regarded as object of κατάκρισις primarily the incestuous person, and secondarily the whole church, in so far as it has acted towards this man with unchristian leniency. This explanation falls to

¹ This also in opposition to de Wette's way of completing the thought : “Impute no evil designs to me in writing the first

Epistle. For such imputation I have given you no occasion in my apostolic conduct. I have wronged no one,” etc.

the ground with Rückert's view of ver. 2 ; the *ἐστέ* that follows puts it beyond doubt that *ὑμῶν* is really to be supplied with *πρὸς κατάκρ.* for its explanation. According to de Wette, *οὐ π. κατάκρ. λ.* applies in form, no doubt, to ver. 2, but in substance more to the censure, of which the expostulatory tone of ver. 2 had created an expectation ; in other words, it applies to something *not really said*, which is arbitrary, since what was said was fitted sufficiently to appear as *κατάκρισις*. — *προεῖρηκα γάρ*] *for I have said before* (vi. 11 f.), *antea dixi*, as 3 Macc. vi. 35, 2 Macc. xiv. 8, and often in classical writers. Comp. Eph. iii. 3. This contains the *proof* that he *οὐ πρὸς κατάκρισιν λέγει* ; for, if he spoke now *unto condemnation*, he would *contradict* his former words. — *ὅτι ἐν ταῖς καρδ. κ.τ.λ.*] Comp. Phil. i. 7. In vi. 11 f. he has expressed not these *words*, but their *sense*. By his adding the definition of degree, *εἰς τὸ συναποθ. κ.τ.λ.*, Paul becomes his own interpreter. — *εἰς τὸ συναποθανεῖν καὶ συζῆν*] is usually taken (see still Rückert, de Wette, Ewald, also Osiander, who, however, mixes up much that is heterogeneous) as : *so that I would die and live with you*, and this as “*vehementissimum amoris indicium, nolle nec in vita nec in morte ab eo quem ames separari*,” Estius, on which Grotius finely remarks : “*egregius χαρακτήρ boni pastoris*, Joh. x. 12.” Comparison is made with the Horatian *tecum vivere amem, tecum obeam lubens* (*Od.* iii. 9. 24), and similar passages in Wetstein. But against this may be urged not only the position of the two words, of which the *συναποθανεῖν* must logically have been put last, but also the perfectly plain construction, according to which the subject of *ἐστέ* must also be the subject of *συναπ.* and *συζῆν* : *you are in our hearts in order to die and to live with (us)*,¹ *i.e.* in order not to depart from our hearts (from our love) in death, if it is appointed to us to die, and in life, if it is appointed to us to remain in life. For he, whom we love, dies and lives with us, when regarded, namely, from the idea of our heartfelt love to him, and from our sympathetic point of view feeling this consciousness of love which has him always present to our heart—a consciousness according to which we, dying and living, know him in our hearts as sharing death and life with us. And how natural that Paul, beset with continual deadly perils (vi. 9), should have put the *συναποθανεῖν* *first* ! in which case *συζῆν* is to be referred to *eternal* life just as little as *ζῶμεν* in vi. 9 (Ambrosiaster, comp. Osiander). Hence the thought can as little surprise us, and as little appear “*tolerably meaningless*” (de Wette), as the conception of *alter ego*. Hofmann, too, with his objection (“*since they, nevertheless, in fact do not die with him*,” etc.) mistakes the psychological delicacy and thoughtfulness of the expression ; and wishes to interpret it—which no reader could have hit on (especially as *προεῖρ.* does not point back further than to vi. 11)—from vi. 9 and iv. 11 to the effect that the life of the apostle is a continual dying, in which he yet remains always in life, and that consequently it is his life so constituted which the readers share, when they are in his heart.

Ver. 4. A further, and that a psychological, proof for the *οὐ πρ. κατάκρ. λέγω*. — *παρρησία* is the internal frame of mind, the *good joyous confidence* (see

¹ There is no justification for departing in any passage from the *telic* reference of *εἰς* with the infinitive. Comp. on viii. 6.

on Eph. iii. 12), without which no *καύχησις*, no *self-boasting* for the sake of the readers, would outwardly take place (*ὑπέρ*, as in v. 12, viii. 24). To take it of the *libertas loquendi* (Pelagius, Beza, Luther, Vatablus, Cornelius à Lapide, and many others, including Schrader and Ewald) is inappropriate, because by the *παρρησία* in *this* sense there would be no negation of *πρὸς κατὰκρ. λέγειν*. And the taking the *καύχησις* of *inward* boasting before *God* (Osiander), ought to have been precluded by ver. 14, comp. ix. 3.—*πεπληρ. κ.τ.λ.*] The two clauses form a climax, so that *πεπλ.* is correlative with *ὑπερπέρ.* and *παρακλ.* with *χαρᾶ*. In the use of the *article* with *παρακλ.* and *χαρᾶ* Paul already looks to the *special* comfort and joy, of which he intends to speak further (ver. 7). *The dative of the instrument* (as at 2 Macc. vi. 5, vii. 21; 3 Macc. iv. 10) is used with *πληρ.* in the N. T. also at Rom. i. 29, and in classic Greek, though seldom. See Elmsley, *ad Soph. Oed. Col.* 16; Blomfield, *Gloss. Aesch. Agam.* 163; Bernhardt, p. 168. Comp. also Jacobs, *ad Anthol.* XI. p. 209. — *ὑπερπερισσεύομαι*] *I am exceeding richly provided with*, Mosch. vi. 13; comp. the passive in Matt. xiii. 12, xxv. 29. The *present* sets forth the thing as still continuously taking place. — *ἐπὶ πάσῃ τῇ θλίψει ἡμ.*] does not belong to *τῇ χαρᾶ*, but to both the entire statements *πεπληρ. τῇ παρακλ.* and *ὑπερπερισσ. τῇ χαρᾶ*; and *ἐπὶ* is not, as Grotius thought, *post*, as in Herod. i. 45: *ἐπ' ἐκείνῃ τῇ συμφορῇ* (see, generally, Wurm, *ad Dinarch.* p. 39 f.), since (comp. i. 3–11) the tribulation still continues, but *in, at*. See Winer, p. 367 [E. T. 490].

Ver. 5. In all our tribulation, I say, for even after we had come to Macedonia we had no rest. — In this *καί, even*, Paul refers back to what was stated in ii. 12, 13; but it does not follow that with Flatt we should regard what lies between as a digression. — *ἔσχηκεν*] as in ii. 13. Still B F G K (not $\aleph$), Lachmann, have the reading *ἔσχεν*, which appears to be original and altered into accordance with ii. 13. — *ἡ σὰρξ ἡμῶν*] *our flesh*, denotes here, according to the connection, the purely human essence as determined by its corporeo-psychical nature, in its moral impotence and sensuous excitability, apart from the divine *πνεῦμα*, without whose influence even the moral nature of man (the human *πνεῦμα* with the *νοῦς*) lacks the capacity for determining and governing the ethical life. (P⁵) Comp. on Rom. iv. 1; John iii. 6. The *σὰρξ* with its life-principle the *ψυχὴ* is by itself morally incapable even in the regenerate man, and stands too much in antagonism to the divine *πνεῦμα* (see on Gal. v. 17), not to have unrest, despondency, etc., occurring even in him when he confronts the impressions of struggle and suffering. Comp. Matt. xxvi. 41. No doubt the expression in this passage seems not to agree with the *τῷ πνεύματί μου* in ii. 12; but there, where, besides, Paul is speaking simply of himself, he speaks only of *inward* unrest, of anxious thoughts in the moral consciousness; whereas here (where he includes also Timothy) he speaks of *outward* (*ἐξωθεν μάχαι*) and *inward* (*ἐσωθεν φόβοι*) assaults, so that that which lies, as it were, in the middle and is affected on both sides is the *σὰρξ*.¹ Rückert brings in here

¹ Ernesti, *Urspr. d. Sünde*, I. p. 56, has wrongly objected to this interpretation

that Paul would have said *ἡ ψυχὴ ἡμῶν*. He might have done so, but there was no

also his groundless hypothesis regarding an illness of the apostle. — ἀλλ' ἐν παντὶ θλιβόμενοι] Paul continues as if he had written previously : οὐκ ἡμεθα ἀνεσιν ἔχοντες, or οὐκ ἐν ἀνέσει ἡμεθα, or οὐχ ἡσυχοὶ ἡμεθα, or the like. Quite similar departures from the construction are found also in the classics. See Matthiae, p. 1293 ; Fritzsche, *Dissert.* II. p. 49. Comp. i. 7, εἰδότες, and the remark on it. It arises from vividness of excitement as the thought proceeds. Comp. Kühner, II. p. 617. Buttmann, *neut. Gram.* p. 256 [E. T. 298]. — ἐξωθεν μάχαι, ἐσωθεν φόβοι] The omission of ἦσαν gives greater prominence to the short, concise representation. Chrysostom, Theophylact, Pelagius, Calvin, Grotius, Bengel, Wetstein, and others, also Schrader, explain ἐξωθεν and ἐσωθεν as *extra* and *intra ecclesiam* ; and of this various interpretations are given ; Chrysostom holding that the former applies to unbelievers, the latter to the weak brethren ; Theodoret : that the former applies to the false teachers, the latter to the weak brethren ; and Grotius : that the former applies to the Jews and heathen, the latter to the false teachers. But after ἡ σὰρξ ἡμῶν (see above), and on account of φόβοι, it is more in keeping with the context to refer it to the *subject* : *from without struggles* (with opponents, who may have been Christian or non-Christian), *from within* (from our own minds) *fears*. The latter are not defined more precisely ; but it is in keeping with the contrast of χαρῆναι afterwards in ver. 7 to think of *fears regarding the circumstances of the Corinthians*, and in particular regarding the *effect of his former Epistle* on them (comp. also ii. 12). Hofmann holds, without any basis in the text, that Paul was apprehensive lest the conflicts to be undergone by him (probably with the Jews) might *degenerate into persecutions*.

Vv. 6, 7. Τοὺς ταπεινοὺς] *the lowly, i.e.* the bowed down. This ὁ παρακαλῶν τοὺς ταπεινοὺς is a general designation of God, significant in its practical bearing (comp. i. 3), so that the suffering ἡμεῖς (in παρεκάλεσεν ἡμᾶς) belong to the *category* of the ταπεινοί. — ὁ θεός] is brought in later by way of attraction, because ὁ παρακαλῶν . . . παρεκάλεσεν ἡμᾶς were the chief conceptions. Comp. Kühner, *ad Xen. Anab.* iv. 3. 1. — ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ] *through the arrival*. — Τίτου] See Introd. § 1. — οὐ μόνον δὲ κ.τ.λ.] A delicate form of transition. *Not merely through his arrival*, not only through the reunion with him did God comfort us, *but also through the comfort, wherewith he was comforted in regard to you* (1 Thess. iii. 7) *while he announced to us*, etc. When Titus informed us of your desire, etc., this information had so soothing an effect on himself that we too were soothed. Comp. Ewald. The usual view, that Paul meant to say : *through the comfort which he brought to me, for he related to me*, etc., and thus wrote with logical inaccuracy, is as arbitrary as Hofmann's way of escaping the difficulty—for which he adduces erroneously 1 Thess. iii. 10—that it must have run properly (?) in the form of παρακληθεὶς ἀνήγγειλεν. Certainly Titus had himself been comforted by what he saw in Corinth ; but psychologically it was most natural that this “being comforted” on the part of Titus should be repeated and renewed by his *com-*

need for it ; the σὰρξ rather corresponds with the ἐξωθεν most naturally as that which is first affected from without.

communicating to Paul and Timothy his cheering observations and experiences, and so they too were comforted with the comfort which was afforded to Titus himself by the report which he was able to give. This interpretation—in which there is thus not to be assumed any blending of the comfort which Titus had felt in perceiving the improved state of matters at Corinth, and then in communicating it (Osiander)—is neither unnatural (Hofmann) nor turning on punctilious reflection (de Wette), but founded necessarily on the words, which Paul has not *written* otherwise, just because he has not *conceived* them otherwise. — ἐπιπόθησιν] *longing*, namely, to see me again among you. — ὀδυρμόν] *lamentation*, for having saddened me so by the disorders tolerated in your church, especially in reference to the incestuous person. Comp. vv. 11, 12. — τὸν ὑμῶν ζῆλον ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ] *your eager interest for me*, to soothe me, to obey me, etc. There was no need to repeat the article here after ζῆλον, since we may say ζηλοῦν or ζῆλον ἔχειν ὑπὲρ τινος (Col. iv. 13), in which case ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ is blended so as to form one idea with ζῆλον. Comp. on Gal. iii. 26 and Fritzsche. *Opusc.* p. 245. — ὥστε με μᾶλλον χαρῆναι] *so that I was all the more glad*. The emphasis is on μᾶλλον (*magis* in Vulgate) ; on its meaning, *all the more*, comp. Nägelsbach on the *Iliad*, p. 227, ed. 3. The apostle's joy was made all the *greater* by the information longed for and received, since from it he learned how, in consequence of his letter, *the Corinthians had on their part* now met him with so much longing, pain, and zeal. Observe in this the emphatic prefixing, thrice repeated, of the ὑμῶν, which gives the key to this μᾶλλον χαρῆναι. The former Epistle had had its effect. *He* had previously had *for them* longing, pain, zeal ; now, *on their part*, such longing, etc., had set in *for him*. Thus the position of things had happily changed *on the part of the church*, which before was so indifferent, and in part even worse, in its mood towards Paul. Billroth, following Bengel, takes it : so that I rather *rejoiced*, *i.e.* so that my former pain was not merely taken away, but was changed into joy. Comp. also Hofmann.¹ In this case μᾶλλον would be *potius*. But the very prefixing of the μᾶλλον, and still more the similarity of ver. 13, are against this. — Theophylact, we may add, has rightly remarked that Paul could *with truth* write as he does in this passage, inasmuch as he wisely leaves to the readers the *distingue personas*.

Ver. 8 f. Information regarding this μᾶλλον χαρῆναι, explaining the ground of it. With εἰ καὶ μετεμελόμην there begins a new protasis, the apodosis of which is νῦν χαίρω κ.τ.λ., so that the βλέπω γὰρ κ.τ.λ., which stands between, assigns parenthetically the ground of the protasis. *For if I have even saddened you in my Epistle, I do not regret it ; if I did regret it* (which I have no wish to deny) *formerly* (and as I now perceive, not without ground, *for I learn from the accounts of Titus that that Epistle, if even for a short time, has saddened you*), *now I am glad*, etc. Comp. Luther ; Rinck, *Lucubr. crit.*

¹ Who finds the meaning to be : "that with the apostle *for his own person* the comfort, which he shared *with Timothy*, rose *into joy*." In that case ἐμέ at least must have been used instead of the enclitic με.

The transition to the first person singular is caused simply by the fact, that Paul now has in view the rebuke and injunction of the former Epistle, chap. v.

p. 162, and the punctuation of Lachmann and Tischendorf ; also Kling. Only in this way of dividing and interpreting this passage does the explanatory statement advance in a simple logical way (1, I do not regret ; 2, if I did previously regret, now I am glad), and the imperfect *μετεμελ.* stand in right correlation with the present *νῦν χαίρω*, so that *μετεμελόμην* applies to the time before the *present joyful mood was reached*. The common punctuation, adopted also by Osiander and Hofmann, which connects *εἰ καὶ μετεμελ.* with the previous words, and begins a new sentence with *νῦν χαίρω*, breaks asunder the logical connection and the correlation of the parts, and leaves *βλέπω γὰρ κ.τ.λ.* (which must be the reason assigned for *οὐ μεταμέλομαι*, as Hofmann also correctly holds, and not for *ἐλύπησα ὑμᾶς*, as Olshausen, de Wette, and others would make it) without any proper reference. Bengel, indeed, wishes to take *εἰ καὶ* before *πρ. ὥρ.* *elliptically*: “*Contristavit vos, inquit, epistola tantummodo ad tempus vel potius ne ad tempus quidem.*” But it is not the bare *εἰ καὶ* which is thus used elliptically, but *εἰ καὶ ἄρα*, or more often *εἵπερ ἄρα*, even *εἰ ἄρα* (see Vigerus, ed. Herm. p. 514 ; comp. Hartung, *Partikell.* I. p. 440 ; Klotz, *ad Devar.* p. 521) ; further, *πρὸς ὥραν* must have logically stood before *εἰ καὶ* ; lastly, the thought itself would be in the highest degree unsuitable, since Paul could not cast doubt on the genuine sadness of the readers (comp. *ὀδυρμόν*, ver. 7, and see ver. 9 ff.). The meaning would not be, as Bengel thinks, *ἡθους apostolici plenissimum*, but in contradiction to the context. Billroth would (and Chrysostom in a similar way) bring out a logical grounding of *οὐ μεταμέλομαι* by taking *βλέπω* as meaning : *I take into consideration* ;¹ “*I take into consideration that it has saddened you, though only for a short time, as I had intended ; by allowing yourselves to be saddened, you have shown that you are susceptible to amendment*” (ii. 2). But in this way everything, in which the probative force is supposed to lie, is *imported*. This is the case also with Hofmann, who makes (comp. Bengel above) *εἰ καὶ* form by itself alone a parenthetic elliptic sentence, but in a concessive sense, so that the import of the whole is held to be : “*Although the Epistle has saddened them, it is a temporary, not a permanent, sadness with which it has filled them. This the apostle sees, and he therefore does not regret that he has saddened them by it.*” Paul does not write in this enigmatical fashion ; he would have said intelligibly : *ἡ ἐπιστ. ἐκείνη, εἰ καὶ ἐλύπησεν ὑμᾶς, πρὸς ὥραν ἐλύπησεν*, or, at any rate, have added to *εἰ καὶ* the appropriate verb (comp. ver. 12). Such an elliptic *εἰ καὶ* is as unexampled as that which is assumed by Bengel, and both serve only to misconstrue and distort the meaning of the words. Rückert comes nearest to our view ; he proposes to read *βλέπων* (as also Lachmann, *Praef.* p. xii., would), and to make the meaning : “*That I have thus saddened you I do not regret, but although I regretted it (εἰ δὲ καὶ μετέμελόμην) when I saw that that Epistle had caused you . . . sadness, still I am glad now,*” etc. But apart from the very weak attestation for the reading *βλέπων*, and apart also from the fact that *εἰ δὲ καὶ* would be *although, however, not but although*, *βλέπων*

¹ Camerarius already took it as *hoc intueor et considero*. It is simply *animadverto, cog-*

nosco (Rom. vii. 23). Comp. Jacobs, *ad Anthol.* II. 3, p. 203.

. . . ἐλύπησεν ὑμᾶς would only contain a very superfluous and cumbrous repetition of the thought already expressed in the acknowledgment εἰ καὶ ἐλύπησα ὑμᾶς, since βλέπων would *not* apply to the insight gained from the news brought by Titus. Ewald has the peculiar view, which is simply an uncalled for and arbitrary invention, that Paul intended to write : for I see that that Epistle, though it saddened you for a short time, has *yet brought you to a right repentance* ; but feeling this to be unsuitable, he suddenly changed the train of thought and went on : *I am now glad*, etc. Neander has a view quite similar.—On πρὸς ὥραν, comp. Philem. 15 ; Gal. ii. 5. The clause “*although for a short time*” is here a delicately thoughtful addition of sympathetic love, which has in view the fact that the sadness caused by it will only last *up to the receipt of the present Epistle*, which is intended to assure the readers of the apostle's pardon and joy (comp. ii. 4 ff.).

REMARK.—Some make an alteration in the meaning of εἰ καὶ μετεμελόμην : *etiamsi poenituisset* (Erasmus, Castalio, Vatablus, and others, including Flatt) ; or hold that *poenitere* is here equivalent to *dolorem capere* (Calvin, comp. Grotius) ; or suggest explanations such as : “Non autem dolere potuit de eo *quod* scripserit cum severitate propter schismata . . . ; hoc enim omne factum instinctu divino per *θεοπνευστίαν* ; sed quod contristati fuerint epistola sua et illi, quos illa increpatio adeo non tetigit,” Calovius (comp. Grotius) ; or the more ingenious device of Beza : “ut significet apostolus, se ex epistola illa acerbius scripta nonnullum dolorem cepisse, non quasi quod fecerat optaret esse infectum, sed quod clementis patris exemplo se ad hanc severitatem coactum esse secum gemens, eventum rei expectaret.” But these are forced shifts of the conception of mechanical inspiration. The Theopneustia does not put an end to the spontaneity of the individual with his varying play of human emotions ; hence Wetstein is so far right in remarking ; “*Interpretes, qui putant, et consilium scribendi epistolam* (rather of writing in so hard a vein of chastisement), *et ejus consilii poenitentiam, et poenitentiae poenitentiam ab afflatu Spir. sancti fuisse profectam, parum consentanea dicere videntur.*” Not as if such alternation of moods testified against the existence of inspiration ; but it attests its dependence on the natural conditions of the individual in the mode of its working, which was not only different in different subjects, but was not alike even in individuals where these were differently determined by outer and inner influences ; so that the divine side of the Scripture does not annul the human, or make it a mere phantom, nor can it be separated from it mechanically. It is indissolubly blended with it. (q⁵)

Ver. 9. Νῦν χαίρω] see on ver. 8. To take the νῦν not in a temporal, but in a causal sense (*proinde, jam vero*, with Emmerling and Billroth), is quite at variance with the context, because the thought is implied in the previous clause : I *no longer* regret it. — οὐχ ὅτι ἐλυνπ.] not regarding the sadness caused to you *in itself*. — κατὰ θεόν] *according to God*, i.e. in a way in keeping with the divine will. See on Rom. viii. 27. Bengel aptly remarks : “*Secundum hic significat sensum animi Deum spectantis et sequentis.*” Not : by God's operation, which (in opposition to Hofmann) Paul never expresses by κατὰ (nor yet is it so even in 1 Pet. iv. 6) ; with the Greeks, however, κατὰ θεόν

means according to divine *disposal*. — *ἵνα ἐν μηδενὶ ζημιωθ. ἐξ ἡμῶν*] not : *ita ut*, etc. (so Rückert), but the divinely-ordained aim of the previous *ἐλνπήθητε κατὰ θεόν* : *in order that ye in no point* (comp. vi. 3 ; Phil. i. 28 ; Jas. i. 4), in no sort of way (not even in the way of severe, saddening reproof), *should have hurt* (injury as to the Messianic salvation) *from us*, from whom, in fact, only the furtherance of your true welfare ought to proceed. See ver. 10. According to Osiander, *ἐν μηδενί* means : in no part of the Christian life (neither in the joyfulness of faith nor in purity of morals). At variance with the context : for to the matters negatived by *ἐν μηδενί* must belong the *λύπη* itself caused by him, which, had it not occurred *κατὰ θεόν*, would have injured the *σωτηρία* of the readers (ver. 10). — The clause of purpose is to be *connected* with the *ἐλνπ. γ. κατὰ θεόν* immediately preceding, which is no parenthetical remark, but is the regulative thought controlling what follows (in vv. 10, 11) ; wherefore *ἵνα κ.τ.λ.* is not, with Hofmann, to be attached to *ἐλνπ. εἰς μετάνοιαν*.

Ver. 10. Ground assigned for *ἵνα ἐν μηδ. ζημιωθ. ἐξ ἡμῶν*. *for godly sadness works repentance unto salvation unregretted*, i.e. unto the Messianic salvation, the attainment of which is not regretted. The connection of *ἀμεταμέλ.* with *σωτηρίαν* is held by Augustine and other Latin Fathers, following the Vulgate, which has *stabilem*,¹ and among modern expositors by Fritzsche, Billroth (yet doubtfully), Schrader, de Wette, Ewald ; decidedly by Castalio also, but undecidedly by Erasmus, *Annot.* The more common connection is with *μετάνοιαν*, so as to give the antanaclasis *poenitentiam non poenitentiam* (for similar collocations see Wetstein, comp. Pliny, *Ep.* vii. 10) ; οὐδεὶς γὰρ ἑαυτοῦ καταγνώσεται, εἰ μὴ λυπηθῇ ἐφ' ἁμαρτία, εἰ μὴ πενθήσῃ καὶ ἑαυτὸν συντρίψῃ, Chrysostom. But for such an antanaclasis Paul would not have chosen an adjective from quite a different root, but *ἀμετανόητον* (Lucian, *Abd.* 11, comp. also Rom. ii. 5), which is also the reading² of some minor authorities. And if *ἀμεταμέλ.* were to belong to *μετάνοιαν*, it would stand immediately by its side, so as to make *εἰς σωτηρίαν* appear as the result throwing light upon *ἀμεταμέλ.* When placed after *εἰς σωτηρίαν*, *ἀμεταμέλ.* is an epithet of *μετάνοιαν* no longer suitable, insipid, and halting. Olshausen and Hofmann wrongly object that the epithet is not suitable to the idea of salvation, the absolute good. It expresses by way of litotes the eternal satisfaction of the *σωτηρία*, and is selected with a glance back to what was said in ver. 8. (R⁵) If the apostle, namely, has caused a sadness which works a contrition unto a salvation exposed *to no regret*, it is obvious how this step of his can no longer give rise to any regret in his case, but can only make him joyful. Comp. on the expression itself, Rom. xi. 29, and especially Plato, *Tim.* p. 59 D : *ἀμεταμέλητον ἡδονὴν κτᾶται*, Legg. ix. p. 866 E ; Polyb. xxi. 9. 11 ; Plutarch, *Mor.* p. 137 B ; Socrates in Stob. 101, p. 552 ; Clem. *Cor.* I. 2. — *ἡδὲ τοῦ κόσμου λύπη*] i.e. *the sadness, however, which is felt by the world*, by the ungodly-minded unbelievers. This is certainly *λύπη διὰ χρήματα, διὰ δόξαν, διὰ τὸν ἀπελθόντα κ.τ.λ.* (Chrysostom), in so far, namely, as the loss of outward

¹ According to the reading *ἀμετάβλητον*, which Origen has (once), but before *εἰς σωτηρ.*

² And which (in opposition to Osiander) would have expressed the idea of something painful quite as well as *ἀμεταμέλ.*

advantage in and for itself determines the sadness,¹ but the genitive τοῦ κόσμου is the *genitivus subjecti*, and we must retain as the characteristic of this λύπη that it is *not* κατὰ θεόν (because it cannot be determined by the knowledge of God and of His will) ; hence, instead of working repentance unto salvation, it works despondency, despair, exasperation, obduracy, etc., unto death. Even διὰ χρήματα κ.τ.λ. there may be a sadness κατὰ θεόν. — θάνατον] *i.e.* not generally : “all that is embraced in a state of things not founded on God” (Hofmann), but, as the opposite of that unregretted σωτηρία, *eternal death*, the Messianic ἀπώλεια ; comp. ii. 16. Calovius says aptly : “quia mundus dolet, cum affligitur, solatii ex verbo Dei expers ac fide destitutus.” The exposition of *vexing oneself to death* (Theodoret), or the reference made by Grotius, Rosenmüller, and others to *fatal diseases* and *suicide*, is quite at variance with the context ; and Ecclus. xxxviii. 18 has no bearing here. Even the *ethical* view (*moral ruin* through despair or new sins, de Wette, comp. Neander) is not in keeping with the contrast to σωτηρία ; besides, Paul never uses θάνατος of *ethical* death. See on Rom. v. 12.—Regarding the difference between ἐργάζεται and κατεργάζ. (*bring to pass*), see on Rom. i. 27 ; van Hengel, *ad Rom.* II. 10.

Ver. 11. What has just been said of the godly sorrow is now proved by experience from the instance of the readers themselves. *For see, this very thing* (nothing else), *the having been afflicted with godly sorrow*, etc. The emphatic use of the preparatory τοῦτο before infinitives is very common in classic writers. See Kühner, II. p. 330 ; Breitenb. *ad Xen. Oec.* 14. 10. — ἡμῖν] not : *among you*, but : *vobis*. — σπουδῇ] *activity*, namely, to efface and make amends for the offence, as opposed to their previous negligence in regard to the incestuous person. — ἀλλά] *yea rather, imo*, corrective, and thereby advancing beyond the last idea (comp. 1 Cor. iii. 2 ; John xvi. 2). Paul feels that he has said too little by using σπουδῇ. The co-ordinate repetition of ἀλλά before each point lays on each a special emphasis. Comp. on 1 Cor. vi. 11. — ἀπολογίαν] πρὸς ἐμέ, Chrysostom and Theophylact rightly say ; but we must at the same time observe that they have answered for themselves in the first instance *to Titus*, and through *him* to Paul (that they were not partakers in the guilt of the incestuous person). Billroth understands the *de facto* exculpation by the adjudging of punishment to the transgressor. An arbitrary view, and opposed to the context (ἐκδίκησιν). Ewald, in accordance with his assumption of a letter in reply now lost, refers it to the latter. — ἀγανάκτησιν] *displeasure, vexation*, that such a disgraceful thing had been carried on in the church. — φόβον] “ne cum virga venirem” (Bengel), namely, in the event of the state of things not being amended (1 Cor. iv. 21), or even of new transgressions. Comp. Chrysostom and Theophylact. The explanation : *fear of God's punishments* (Pelagius, Calvin, Flatt, Olshausen), is at variance with the context (ἐπιπόθησ.). — ἐπιπόθη.] as in ver. 7, longing after the apostle's coming. — ζῆλον] not as in ver. 7, where ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ is associated with it, but, as is suggested by the fol-

¹ As this would have been the case also with the Corinthians, if they had grieved over the reproof only, and not over the sin.

Comp. Elwert in the *Württemberg. Stud.* IX. 1, p. 135 ff.

lowing ἐκδίκησιν (punishment of the transgressor) : *disciplinary zeal* against the incestuous person, not zeal in general for the honour of Christ, of the church, and of the apostle (Osiander). The six objects introduced by ἀλλά go logically in pairs, so that ἀπολογ. and ἀγανάκτ. relate to the disgrace of the church, φόβον and ἐπιπόθ. to the apostle, and ζῆλον and ἐκδίκησιν to the incestuous person, the latter, however, without the arbitrary distinction drawn by Bengel, that ζῆλον refers to the good of his soul, and ἐκδικ. only to his punishment for his transgression. ζῆλος is the zeal for both. — ἐν παντὶ συνεστήσατε κ.τ.λ.] a judgment on the whole matter added asyndetically, and so with the more weight (Dissen, *ad Pind. Exc.* II. p. 278) : *in every respect you have proved that you yourselves are innocent as regards the matter in question.* By this the Corinthians are acquitted from *positive* participation in the offence ; they could not be acquitted (comp. 1 Cor. v. 6) of a *negative* participation (through toleration and connivance), but this is not further touched on in accordance with his purpose, which is here throughout conciliatory. — ἐαυτοὺς] you *for your own person*, as opposed to the evil-doer. — On συνίστημι, with the accusative and infinitive, comp. Diod. Sic. i. 96, xiv. 45. Without εἶναι (comp. Gal. ii. 18) the attribute would appear as purely *objective*, as the proved *fact* ; with εἶναι the expression is *subjective*, denoting the relation from the standpoint of the readers. Comp. in general, Krüger, § 65, 1. 4. — The dative τῷ πράγματι is that of ethical reference, expressing the matter *with respect to which* what is affirmed takes place. See Matthiae, p. 876 ; Bernhardt, p. 84. Comp. ἐλεύθεροι . . . τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ, Rom. vi. 20 ; Matt. v. 8. This, at the same time, in opposition to Rückert's assertion that ἐν (see the critical remarks) *cannot* be dispensed with. On the term itself, Bengel rightly remarks : “indefinite loquitur de re odiosa.” Comp. ii. 5 ff.

Ver. 12. Ἄρα] *therefore*, for how natural was it for the readers to think that Paul had written on account of the ἀδικήσαντος and on account of the ἀδικηθέντος ! And yet the effect which that part of the Epistle had produced on themselves had showed them by experience that the apostle's *true* purpose was quite different. So at least Paul represents the matter in a delicate and conciliatory way. — εἰ καὶ ἔγραψα ὑμῖν] *if I have also written to you, i.e. have not kept silence, but have expressed myself by letter regarding the affair in question.* Commonly a *so, so sternly*, or the like, is imported quite arbitrarily. Grotius indicates the right meaning : “si quid scripsi, nempe ea de re.” Comp. Osiander. Those who assume an Epistle now lost between our first and second (Bleek, Neander, Ewald, Beyschlag, Hilgenfeld) find it here alluded to. Comp. ii. 3, 9. The apodosis already begins at οὐχ εἵνεκεν κ.τ.λ., and does not follow only at διὰ τοῦτο (as Hofmann complicates it, without sufficient ground), the more especially as in this construction, according to Hofmann, διὰ τοῦτο does not apply to ver. 12—to which it must apply (comp. 1 Thess. iii. 7)—but to ver. 11. — οὐχ . . . ἀλλ'] is not *non tam . . . quam* (Erasmus, Estius, Flatt, and many others), but *non . . . sed.* Paul denies *absolutely* that he has written that part of the Epistle on account of the two persons mentioned. In the nature of the case, no doubt, he had to write against the ἀδικήσας, and so indirectly in favour of the ἀδικηθείς ; but

the *destined purpose* of this letter, as Paul from the true light of his apostolic standpoint is aware, lay not in this aim affecting the two persons primarily concerned, but in its higher significance as bearing on the church's relation to the apostle : ἀλλ' εἵνεκεν τοῦ φανερωθῆναι κ.τ.λ. (s⁵) — Regarding the form εἵνεκεν, see on Luke iv. 18, and Kühner, I. p. 229, ed. 2. The ἀδικήσας is the *incestuous person*, and the ἀδικηθεὶς *his father*, as the party grievously injured by the son's incestuous marriage with the step-mother. Theodoret, however, is quite arbitrary in supposing from this that he was already dead (καὶ τεθνεὼς γὰρ ἠδίκητο, τῆς εὐνῆς ὑβρισθείσης). See on 1 Cor. v. 1. This explanation of the ἀδικηθεὶς seems from the relation of the two participles active and passive to be the only natural, and, in fact, necessary one. It is no objection that, in the first Epistle, nothing was said at length regarding the father and the wrong done to him (see only v. 1), since the censure and ordaining of chastisement to the transgressor *of themselves* practically contained the satisfaction to the injured father. Comp. on the passive ἀδικ. in the sense of infringing *marriage-rights*, Plut. *Anton.* 9 ; Eurip. *Med.* 267, 314 ; and see in general on ἀδικεῖν in reference to adultery, Dorvill. *ad Charit.* p. 468 ; Abresch, *ad Xen. Eph.*, ed Locella, p. 222. Others (Wolf, Storr, Emmerling, Osiander, Neander, Maier) think that Paul means *himself*, in so far as he had been deeply injured in his office by that transgression. But this mode of designating himself, set down thus without any more precise indication, would be strangely enigmatical, as well as marked by want of delicate tact (as if the readers were not ἀδικηθέντες, like Paul !), and no longer suiting what was already said in ii. 5. The reference of τοῦ ἀδικηθέντος to the apostle himself would only be right on the assumption that allusion is here made to the state of things discussed by Paul in an *intermediate letter now lost*.¹ Others (Bengel, comp. Wolf also) think that the *Corinthians* are meant, but the singular is decisive against this view, even apart from the unsuitable meaning. Others have even referred τοῦ ἀδικησ. and τοῦ ἀδικηθ. to the adulterer and the *adulteress* (Theophylact : ἀμρότεροι γὰρ ἀλλήλους ἠδίκησαν) ; others, again, have taken τοῦ ἀδικηθ. as *neuter* (Heinsius, Billroth), equivalent to τοῦ ἀδικήματος. The last is at variance with linguistic usage ; and what sort of delicate apostolic tact would it have been, to say that he had not written *on account of the deed* ! — ἀλλ' εἵνεκεν κ.τ.λ.] According to Lachmann's correct reading, as translated also by Luther (see the critical remarks) : *but because your zeal for us was to become manifest among you before God*, i.e. *but because I wished to bring it about that the zealous interest which you cherish for us should be brought to light among you before God* (a religious expression of uprightness and sincerity, iv. 2). Comp. on the thought, ii. 9 ;

¹ On this assumption Bleek is of opinion that Paul, in that lost Epistle, had rebuked the wanton defiance of the incestuous person towards him (comp. also Neander). According to Ewald, Paul is the ἀδικηθεὶς over against the man of reputation in the church, who had been endeavouring to deprive him of his repute in it by public accusations. Comp. Hilgenfeld in his *Zeitschr.*

1864, p. 169, 1865, p. 252, according to whom Paul is the ἀδικηθεὶς, because things had in the meanwhile come to a pronounced rejection of his apostolic repute. According to Beyschlag in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1865, p. 254, Timothy is meant, who was personally insulted by a spokesman in the ranks of the opponents.

πρὸς ὑμᾶς is the simple *with you, among you, in the midst of you, in your church-life, not exactly in public meeting of the church* (Ewald), which would have been indicated more precisely. Comp. 1 Cor. xvi. 7. Rückert, without due ground, finds the meaning of πρὸς ὑμᾶς so ambiguous that he prefers the *Recepta*, according to which the meaning is : *because our zealous interest for you was to become manifest upon you before God*. Comp. ii. 4. Hoffmann, who rejects both the *Recepta* and the reading of Lachmann, and prefers that of Σ : τ. σπουδὴν ὑμῶν τὴν ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν πρὸς ὑμᾶς, takes this πρὸς ὑμᾶς even in a hostile sense : “You are to show yourselves diligent *for yourselves and against yourselves* ;” the strict procedure of the church against its adherents is on the one hand an acting *for* themselves (ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν), and on the other hand an acting *against* themselves (πρὸς ὑμᾶς). This artificial interpretation is wrong, because, if πρὸς could mean *contra* here, Paul must have written at least τὴν ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν τε καὶ πρὸς ὑμᾶς, and because πρὸς with σπουδὴ (Heb. vi. 11 ; Herod. iv. 11. 1 ; Diod. xvii. 114) and with σπουδάσειν (Dem. 515. 23, 617. 10) has not that arbitrarily assumed sense, but the sense of an interest *for* some one, though this is more commonly expressed by περί. If the reading of Σ were right, it would have to be explained simply : *in order that your zeal, in which you aim at your own good, should become manifest among you before God*. Had Paul wished to express the singular meaning which Hoffmann imports, he would have known how to write : τὴν σπουδὴν ὑμῶν τὴν ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν τε καὶ καθ’ ὑμῶν.

Ver. 13. *Wherefore, because I had no other purpose than this (which is now attained), we are comforted ; and, to our consolation there was further added a very great increase in joy over the joy of Titus, etc.* — ἐπὶ δὲ τῇ παρακλ. ἡμ.] ἐπὶ used of supervening on something already in existence.¹ See Matthiae, p. 1371 ; Winer, p. 368 [E. T. 490]. — περισσοτ. μᾶλλον ἐχάρημεν] the joy of our consolation *became* still more increased. Comp. on ver. 7. Regarding the strengthening of the comparative by μᾶλλον, see Pflugk, *ad Eur. Hec.* 377 ; Heind. *ad Plat. Gorg.* p. 679 E ; Boissonade, *ad Aristaen.* 430. — ὅτι ἀναπέπνυται κ.τ.λ.] does not specify the reason of Paul’s joy (Rückert, although with hesitation), for that is contained in ἐπὶ τ. χαρᾷ Τίτου, but is a more precise definition confirmatory of τῇ χαρᾷ Τίτου ; *since indeed his spirit* (ii. 13) *is refreshed by you all*. ἀναπέπνυται (comp. 1 Cor. xvi. 18 ; Philem. 7, 20) is placed first as the pith of the thought ; ἀπό denotes the *proceeding from, the origin : forth from, from the side of*. See Bernhardt, p. 222 ; Kühner, *ad Xen. Anab.* vi. 5. 18.

REMARK.—According to the *Recepta* διὰ τοῦτο παρακεκλήμεθα ἐπὶ τῇ παρακλήσει ὑμῶν· περισσοτέρως δὲ μᾶλλον κ.τ.λ., the first ἐπὶ is *through, properly on account of*, just as in ἐπὶ τῇ χαρᾷ Τίτου, so that the παράκλησις ὑμῶν is that which causes the παρακεκλήμεθα (Winer, p. 368 [E. T. 491]) : but ὑμῶν is not, with Flatt, de Wette, and many others, to be explained : *by the consolation, which you have afforded to me, but* : “*consolatione vestri*” (Luther, Beza, Cornelius à Lapide, Bengel, and most), i.e. *by your being comforted over the pain, which my*

¹ Yet it may also be taken simply of the state : *in our consolation*. But the explana-

tion above is more in keeping with the climactic character of the discourse.

Epistle caused to you, now by means of the happy change which it has produced among you (ver. 11). The two genitives, namely ἡμῶν and Τίτου, must be taken *uniformly*. On the state of the case delicately denoted by παρακλ. ἡμῶν Calvin aptly remarks : “ Nam correctionis acerbitas facile dulcescit, simulatque gustare incipimus, quam nobis fuerit utilis.” Michaelis, on the other hand, objects that what follows will then be *discourteous*; but the seeming discourtesy disappears before the *reason* for Titus' joy, and is amply outweighed by ver. 14. According to Reiche, *Comm. crit.* I. p. 370, the παράκλησις ἡμῶν means the *admonitio et castigatio* given in the first Epistle, for the sharpness and severity of which Paul is now consoled by the happy result. But after παρακεκλήμεθα, according to the analogy, moreover, of ἐχάρημεν ἐπὶ τῇ χαρῇ, as well as in accordance with vv. 4 and 6, παράκλησις cannot be otherwise taken than as *solatium*.

Ver. 14 f. Polite statement of the reason why the joy of Titus had rejoiced him so greatly. — εἰ τι αὐτῷ ὑπὲρ ὑμ. κεκαυχ.] Comp. ix. 2. Who could deny that Paul, both alone, of which he is thinking here, and in company with Timothy (at which ἡ καύχησις ἡμῶν then glances), had *justly* boasted before Titus (*coram Tito*) to the advantage of the Corinthians (ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν, comp. ix. 2)? See 1 Cor. i. 4 ff. He had, in fact, founded the church and laboured so long in it, and they were in his heart, vii. 3. — οὐ κατησχίνθη] This κατησχ. would have taken place, if Titus had experienced among you an opposite state of things, contradicting the truth of my καύχησις. But when he came to you : διὰ τῶν ἔργων ἐδείξατέ μου τὰ ῥήματα, Chrysostom. — ἀλλ' ὥς πάντα κ.τ.λ.] Opposite of οὐ κατησχ. : “ as we have spoken *everything* truly to you, our *boasting before Titus* has also become truth.” No doubt Paul is here making a passing allusion to the attack on his veracity (comp. i. 17 ff.), and that in such a way as emphatically to confront it with, first, *what was said* by him (πάντα . . . ἡ καύχησις ἡμῶν), and then the *persons* to whom he spoke (ὑμῖν . . . ἡ ἐπὶ Τίτου). Thus the first, and next to it the last, place in the arrangement of the sentence has the emphasis (Kühner, II. p. 625). — πάντα] quite general : we have lied to you in nothing. Chrysostom and Billroth think that it applies to *all the good, which Paul had said of Titus to the Corinthians*,—a purely arbitrary view, not to be guessed by any reader. — ἐν ἀληθείᾳ] *i.e. truthfully*. Comp. Col. i. 6 ; John xvii. 19 ; Pind. *Ol.* vii. 127. The adverbial use is genuine Greek (Matthiae, p. 1342 ; Bernhardt, p. 211), not a Hebraism (Rückert). See on John xvii. 19. — ἐλάλήσαμεν] *locuti sumus*, quite general, and not to be limited, at variance with the context, to *doctrine* (Emmerling, Flatt, Hofmann, and others, following Theodoret). — ἐπὶ Τίτου] *coram Tito*. See Schaefer, *Melet.* p. 105 ; Fritzsche, *Quaest. Luc.* p. 139. — ἐγενήθη] *se praestitit* ; it has shown itself as truth by experience. Comp. i. 19 ; Rom. iii. 4, vii. 13. Often so also in classic writers.

Ver. 15. Καὶ τὰ σπλάγχνα κ.τ.λ.] joyful result of ἡ καύχησις ἡμῶν . . . ἐγενήθη. A comma only is to be put after ver. 14 : *and thus, therefore, his inmost heart* (comp. vi. 12) *is attached to you in a still higher degree* (than before his presence there) *since he remembers*, etc. — εἰς ὑμᾶς ἐστίν] *is for you*. Comp. εἰς αὐτόν, 1 Cor. viii. 6 ; Rom. xi. 36. — ὑπακοήν] namely, towards him,

Titus ; for what follows is epexegetical. — *μετὰ φόβον κ. τρόμον*] *i.e.* with a zeal, which fears lest it should not do enough for its duty. Comp. on 1 Cor. ii. 3.

Ver. 16. Concluding result of the whole section, introduced vividly (without *οὖν*, comp. ver. 12) : “ *I am glad that in every respect I am of good courage through you.* — *ἐν ὑμῖν*] not *as to you*, which would have been expressed prepositionally by *περί, ὑπέρ, ἐπί, πρός, ἔνεκα* (*εἰς*, x. 1, is in an *adverse* sense), but Paul knows his consolation as *cleaving to* the readers ; that is the *causal* nexus, in which his joyous frame of mind depends on them. Comp. Winer, p. 218 [E. T. 291 f.] ; Soph. *Aj.* 1294 : *ἐν ἐμοὶ θρασύς*, 1071 : *ἐν θανοῦσιν ὑβριστῆς γένῃ*, Eurip. *Or.* 754 : *ἐν γυναιξὶν ἀλκιμος*, Ecclus. xxxviii. 23 ; Matt. iii. 17. (T⁵)

NOTES BY AMERICAN EDITOR.

(O⁵) “ *In the fear of God.*” Ver. 1.

This is the motive which is to determine our endeavours to purify ourselves. It is not regard to the good of others nor our own happiness, but reverence for God. We are to be holy because He is holy (Hodge).

(P⁵) “ *Our flesh had no rest.*” Ver. 5.

Flesh of course cannot mean his body, for the sufferings referred to were not corporeal, but mental. The term denotes his whole sensitive nature considered as frail.

(Q⁵) “ *Though I did regret.*” Ver. 8.

The fact that Paul says that he regretted sending a letter, which, however, is universally accepted as canonical and inspired, has been considered as casting doubt upon the doctrine of plenary inspiration. A satisfactory explanation is found in the following remarks of Hodge (*in loc.*) : “ Inspiration rendered its subject infallible in writing and speaking as the messenger of God. Paul might doubt whether he had made a wise use of his infallibility, as he might doubt whether he had wisely exercised his power of working miracles. He never doubted as to the truth of what he had written. There is another thing to be taken into consideration. Inspiration did not reveal itself in consciousness. It is perfectly conceivable that a man might be inspired without knowing it. Paul was no doubt impelled by the Spirit to write his former epistle as well as divinely guided in writing : but all he was conscious of was his own thoughts and feelings. The believer is not conscious of the operations of grace, neither were the apostles conscious of inspiration. As the believer, however, may know that he is the subject of divine influence, so the apostles knew that they were inspired. But as the believer may doubt the wisdom of some of his holiest acts, so the apostles might doubt the wisdom of acts done under divine guidance. Such acts are always wise, but the agent may not always see their wisdom.”

(R⁵) “*Repentance to salvation not to be repented of.*” Ver. 10.

The Revised Version (in which this whole chapter is greatly improved) renders this clause “repentance unto salvation, a repentance which bringeth no regret.” This view of the connection of the last word is favoured by Kling, Hodge, Princ. Brown ; but Beet, Plumptre, and Speaker’s Com. prefer to connect it with salvation. Still one may ask, What kind of a salvation is it that is or can be attended with regret ?

(S⁵) “*Not for his sake that had done the wrong.*” Ver. 12.

The writer speaks of the chief object as if it were the only object, and also of the object which was effected by Providence, as if it had been his object. He did desire to have the offender punished and the injured man righted, but the primary aim was the manifestation to themselves of their regard for his apostolic authority and for himself.—The reading *your* instead of the *our* of the received text is now adopted by all editors, being sustained by greatly preponderating authority.

(T⁵) *End of a discussion.* Ver. 16.

Here concludes the long discussion carried on in the first seven chapters of the Epistle. The entire pericope relates to the state of the Corinthian believers and to Paul’s relation to them. In the course of it he lays bare in the liveliest form his intense human sympathies, and reveals much of his personal character and history. The result of his faithful dealings with the church was the full restoration of confidence. And now he was able to turn to other matters, as we see he did in the next chapter.

CHAPTER VIII.

Ver. 3. ὑπὲρ δύναμιν] Lachm. Rück. and Tisch. read παρὰ δύναμ., on decisive evidence ; ὑπέρ is a gloss. — Ver. 4. After ἀγίων Elz. has δέξασθαι ὑμᾶς, which, on decisive evidence, is rightly struck out by Griesb. and the later editors as a supplementary insertion, though defended by Rinck. — Ver. 5. ἡλπίσαμεν] Only B and 80 have ἡλπικαμεν, just as in ver. 6 only B has ἐνήρξατο. — Ver. 7. ἐξ ἡμῶν ἐν ὑμῖν is attested only by min. and Syr. Arm. Slav. ms. Comp. Orig. : *nostra in vos*. Error of transcription, or correction through misunderstanding. — Ver. 12. After ἔχῃ Elz. and Scholz have τις. An addition in opposition to decisive evidence. — Ver. 13. δέ] is wanting in B C S* min. and Aeth. Clar. Germ. ; deleted by Lachm., and rightly, since it betrays itself as inserted to mark the contrast. — Ver. 16. διδόντι] D E F G L S** and many min. Chrys. Theophyl. have δόντι. Approved by Griesb., adopted by Scholz, Rück. But the aorist has crept in obviously on account of the aorists that follow. — Ver. 19. σύν] B C and many min., also several vss. and Fathers, have ἐν. Recommended by Griesb., adopted by Lachm. Rück. and Tisch. Rightly ; σύν, though defended by Reiche, is an erroneous gloss. — αὐτοῦ] is wanting in B C D* F G L and many min., also in several vss. and Latin Fathers. Suspected by Griesb., deleted by Lachm. Rück. Considering the great preponderance of the adverse evidence, it is more probable that it has crept in by writing τοῦ twice, than that it has been left out on account of its being unnecessary and seemingly unsuitable (Reiche). — Instead of the last ἡμῶν Elz. has ὑμῶν, against decisive testimony. Alteration, because ἡμῶν was held to be unsuitable. — Ver. 21. προνοοῦμεν γάρ] Elz. : προνοοῦμενοι, only supported by later codd. and some Fathers. The participle appears to be a mere copyist's error occasioned by στελλόμενοι, so that at first even the γάρ remained beside it, as is the case still in C, min., and some vss. and Fathers, whom Tisch. follows. But afterwards this γάρ had to be dropped on account of the retention of the participle. — Ver. 24. ἐνδείξασθε] Lachm. and Tisch. read ἐνδεικνύμενοι, following B D* E* F G 17, It. Goth. The imperative is a gloss.¹ — Elz., against decisive testimony, has καί before εἰς πρόσωπον. Added for the sake of connection.

Chap. viii. and ix. The second chief division of the Epistle : *regarding the collection for the poor in Jerusalem* (1 Cor. xvi.), coming very fitly after the praise contained in chap. vii., and having the way appropriately paved for it in particular by the closing words, vii. 16.

Vv. 1–6. The beneficence of the Macedonians has been shown beyond all expectation ; hence we have exhorted Titus to complete among you the work already begun.

Ver. 1. The δέ is the mere μεταβατικόν, leading over to a new topic in the

¹ [Westcott and Hort retain the imperative, and the Canterbury Revision follows them. —T. W. C.]

Epistle. Comp. 1 Cor. vii. 1, viii. 1, xii. 1, xv. 1. — τὴν χάριν τ. θεοῦ τὴν δεδομ. κ.τ.λ.] *the grace of God, which is given in the churches of Macedonia, i.e. how graciously God has wrought in the churches of Macedonia, inasmuch as He (see ver. 2) called forth in them so great liberality.* Comp. ix. 14. The expression rests on the idea, that such excellent dispositions and resolves are produced and nourished, not by independent spontaneity, but by the grace of God working on us (*operationes gratiae*). Comp. Phil. ii. 13. Paul, therefore, does not think of the grace of God as shown to himself (Origen, Erasmus, who paraphrases it: “quemadmodum adfuerit mihi Deus in ecclesiis Maced.” comp. Zachariae, Emmerling, Billroth, Wieseler, *Chronol.* p. 357 ff.; also Rückert, yet with hesitation),—in which case he could not but have added ἐμοί or ἡμῖν, in order to make himself understood,—but, on the contrary, as granted to the liberal churches, working in them the communicative zeal of love, so that the construction with ἐν is quite as in ver. 16 and i. 22.

Ver. 2. A more precise explanation of τὴν χάριν κ.τ.λ., so that ὅτι (*that, namely*) is dependent on γνωρίζομεν. This exposition consists, as was seen by Chrysostom, Theodoret, Erasmus, Luther, Grotius, and many others, of two statements, so that after τῆς χαρᾶς αὐτῶν we must mentally supply the simple ἐστίν.¹ This scheme of the passage, which Osiander and Hofmann also follow, is indicated by ἡ περισσεία in the one half, and ἐπερίσσευσεν in the other, whereby two parallel predicative relations are expressed, as well as by the fact that, if the whole be taken as one sentence, and consequently ἡ περισσ. τ. χαρᾶς αὐτῶν be taken along with the following καὶ ἡ κατὰ βάθους πτωχεία αὐτῶν as the subject of ἐπερίσσευσεν (so by most expositors since Beza), this subject would embrace two very diverse elements, and, besides, there would result the combination not elsewhere occurring: ἡ περισσεία ἐπερίσσευσεν. Hence it is to be explained: *that, namely, in much testing of affliction the abundance of their joyfulness is, i.e. that, while they are much put to the test by sufferings, their joy is plentifully present, and (that) their deep poverty became abundant unto the riches of their single-heartedness, i.e. that they, in their deep poverty, plentifully showed how rich their single-heartedness was.* — ἐν πολλῇ δοκιμῇ θλίψεως] Instead of writing simply ἐν πολλῇ θλίψει, Paul designates this situation according to the wholesome moral aspect, in which it showed itself amongst the Macedonians to their praise. Δοκιμή, namely, is here also not: *trial*, but, as Paul always uses it, *verification* (Rom. v. 4; 2 Cor. ii. 9, ix. 13, xiii. 3; Phil. ii. 22). Chrysostom aptly says: οὐδὲ γὰρ ἀπλῶς ἐθλίβησαν, ἀλλ' οὕτως ὥς καὶ δόκιμοι γενέσθαι διὰ τῆς ὑπομονῆς. The *verification* of their Christian character, which the θλίψις effected in them, was just the moral element, in which the joyfulness πολλῇ καὶ ἄφατος ἐβλάστησεν ἐν αὐτοῖς (Chrysostom), and existed among them in spite of the θλίψις itself, which, moreover, would have been calculated to produce the opposite of χαρά. Regarding the θλίψις of the Macedonians, see 1 Thess. i. 6, ii. 14 ff.; Acts xvi. 20 ff., xvii. 5. The χαρά, the virtue of Christian

¹ Not ἦν; for the *present* corresponds to the perfect δεδομ., and that, which took place

in the happy state of things thus subsisting, is then subjoined by the aorist ἐπερίσσευσεν.

gladness of soul, rising above all afflictions (Gal. v. 22 ; 2 Cor. vi. 10 ; Rom. xiv. 17 ; comp. on John xv. 11), is not yet defined here more precisely as regards its special expression, but is already brought into prominence with a view to the second part of the verse, consequently to the liberality which gladly distributes (ix. 7 ; Acts xx. 35). — ἡ κατὰ βάθους πτωχεία] *the deep poverty*,¹ literally, *that which has gone down to the depth* (Winer, p. 357 [E.T. 477]) ; comp. βάθος κακῶν, Aesch. Pers. 718, Hel. 303 ; ἐς κίνδυνον βαθύν, Pind. Pyth. iv. 368, and the like ; Blomfield, *ad Aesch. Pers. Gloss.* 471. (v^b) The opposite is βαθύπλουτος, Ellendt, *Lex. Soph.* 1. p. 286. — ἐπερίσσευσεν] *became abundant*, i.e. developed an exceedingly great activity, and this εἰς τὸν πλοῦτον κ.τ.λ.,² *unto the riches of their singleness of heart*. (v^b) This is the *result* (Rom. iii. 7 ; 2 Cor. ix. 8) of the ἐπερίσσεια ; so that their simple, upright spirit showed itself as *rich*, in spite of their poverty, through the abundance of kind gifts which they distributed. Note the skill and point of the antithetic correlation purposely marking the expressions in the two parts of the verse. — The ἀπλότης³ is the upright simplicity of heart (Eph. vi. 5 ; Col. iii. 22) ; honestly and straightforwardly it contributes what it can to the work of love without any selfish design or *arrière pensée* (as e.g. the widow with her mite). Comp. on xii. 8. And so it is *rich*, even with deep *poverty* on the part of the givers. The genitive is, as in περισσεία τῆς χάρις, the *genitivus subjecti*, not *objecti* (rich in simplicity), as Hofmann, following older commentators, holds. The αὐτῶν is against this latter view, for either it would have been wanting, or it would have been added to πλοῦτον, because it would belong to that word.

Vv. 3-5. Ὅτι is not dependent on γνωρίζομεν (Hofmann), but gives the proof of what was just said : εἰς τὸν πλοῦτον τῆς ἀπλ. αὐτ. — The construction is plain ; for there is no need to supply an ἦσαν, as many wish, after αἰθαίρετοι or after δεόμενοι, but, as Bengel aptly remarks : “ ἔδωκαν . . . totam periochae structuram sustinet.” Comp. Fritzsche, *Dissert.* II. p. 49 ; Billroth, Ewald, Osiander, Hofmann. There are, namely (and in accordance therewith the punctuation is to be fixed), four modal definitions attached to this ἔδωκαν : *They gave* (1) *according to and beyond their means* ; (2) *of their own impulse* ; (3) *urgently entreating us for the χάρις and κοινωνία κ.τ.λ.* ; and (4) *not as we hoped, but themselves*, etc. This last modal definition is naturally and quite logically attached by καί (hence καὶ οὐ καθὼς ἠλπίσ.) ; and Rückert (comp. de Wette and Neander) is arbitrary in holding this καί to prove that Paul allowed the sentence he had begun to drop, and appended a new one, so that

¹ As a grammatical supplement the simple οὔσα is sufficient ; hence it is not to be taken, with Hofmann, as the poverty *sinking deeper and ever deeper*, but as the *deep-sunk poverty*. On κατὰ with genitive, comp. the Homeric κατὰ χθονός *Il.* iii. 217 ; κατὰ γαίης, *Il.* xiii. 504 ; κατὰ σπείους, *Od.* ix. 330 (*down into the cave*), xii. 93. See in general, Spitzner, *De vi et usu praeppos. ἀνά et κατὰ ap. Homer.* 1831, p. 20 ff.

² The neuter form, τὸ πλοῦτος (Lachm. Tisch. Rück.), is attested here by B C N* 17,

31, but more decidedly in Eph. i. 7, ii. 7, iii. 8, 16 ; Phil. iv. 19 ; Col. i. 27, ii. 2.

³ Hofmann conjectures that the prominence given to the ἀπλότης was called forth by the *want* of it among the *Achaean* Christians. In this case there would be in it a side-allusion, which is not justified in what follows. But the ἀπλότης, which had shown itself among the Macedonians in a specially high degree, was to serve them as an *example*, by way of stimulating *emulation*, not exactly of *putting them to shame*.

after ἡλπίσαμεν we should have to supply an ἐγένετο or ἐποίησαν. — μαρτυρῶ] *I testify it*, a parenthetic assurance. Comp. the Greek use of οἶμαι and the like (Bornem. *ad Xen. Conv.* p. 71, 179 ; Stallb. *ad Plat. Gorg.* p. 460 A). — παρὰ δύναμιν] *i.e.* more amply than was accordant with their resources. See Homer, *Il.* xiii. 787 ; Thucyd. i. 70. 2 ; Lucian. *Nigr.* 28, *de Dom.* 10. The same, in substantial meaning, is ὑπὲρ δύναμιν, i. 8 ; Dem. 292. 25. It forms, with κατὰ δύναμιν, a climactic definition of ἔδωκαν, not of ἀνθαίρ., to which it is not suitable. — ἀνθαίρετοι] excludes human persuasion or compulsion, not the divine influence (see ver. 5, διὰ θελήματος θεοῦ) ; we must not, with Rückert, hold it, on account of the remark ix. 2, to be an *exaggeration*, since the latter notice does not deny the self-determination of the Macedonians, but, when compared with our passage, exhibits as the real state of the case *this*, that Paul had boasted of the readiness of the Achaeans before the Macedonians, but without exhortation to the latter, and that these thereupon, of their own accord, without urging, had resolved on making a contribution, and had given very amply. Comp. Chrysostom on ix. 2. ἀνθαίρετος, *free-willed, self-determined*, only here and at ver. 17 in the N. T., often in the classic writers ; seldom of persons (Xen. *Anab.* v. 7, 29 ; Lucian. *Catapl.* 4). Comp. the adverb in 2 Macc. vi. 19 ; 3 Macc. vi. 6. — μετὰ πολλῆς . . . εἰς τ. ἁγίους] to be taken together : *with much exhortation entreating us for the kindness and the participation in the ministering to the saints, i.e. urgently entreating us that the kindness might be shown them of permitting them to take active part in the . . . work of collections.* Οὐχ ἡμεῖς αὐτῶν ἐδεήθημεν, ἀλλ' αὐτοὶ ἡμῶν, Chrysostom ; and in the κοινωνία sought they saw a *kindness* to be shown to themselves : they knew how to value the work of love thus highly. The χάρις, namely, here is not *grace from God* (Hofmann and the older commentators), since it was requested *from the apostle*, but τὴν χάριν κ. τ. κοινων. is a true ἐν διὰ δυοῖν (*the favour, and indeed the partaking, i.e. the favour of partaking*). See Fritzsche, *ad Matth.* p. 854, and generally, Nägelsbach on *Il.* iii. 100, p. 461, ed. 3. Bengel, who likewise rejects the δέξασθαι ἡμᾶς of the *Recepta*, connects τὴν χάριν κ. τὴν κοινωνίαν κ.τ.λ. with ἔδωκαν : but what a prolix designation of the withal quite self-evident object of ἔδωκαν would that be, while δεόμενοι ἡμῶν would remain quite open and void of definition ! On δεῖσθαι, with accusative of the thing and genitive of the person, comp. Plato, *Apol.* p. 18 A, p. 41 E ; Xen. *Cyrop.* i. 4. 12 ; *Anab.* vii. 3. 5 ; 3 Esd. viii. 53. Yet in the classics the accusative of the object is the neuter of a pronoun, like τοῦτο ὑμῶν δέομαι ; ὅπερ ὑμῶν δέομαι, and the like, or of an adjective (Krüger on *Thuc.* i. 32. 1). — τῆς εἰς τοὺς ἁγίους] In this addition (comp. 1 Cor. xvi. 1), which would in itself be superfluous, there lies a *motive* of the δεόμενοι. — καὶ οὐ καθὼς ἡλπίσαμεν] for *but a little* could be expected from the oppressed and poor Macedonians ! Οὐ περὶ τῆς γνώμης λέγει, ἀλλὰ περὶ τοῦ πλήθους τῶν χρημάτων, Theodoret. According to Hofmann, the words are meant only to affirm that the Macedonians had joined in the contribution *quite of their own resolution*, which *had not been expected* by the apostle. But in this case the remark, which on this interpretation would be no independent element, but only the negative expression of what was already said in ἀνθαίρετοι, would have had its logical position immediately behind ἀνθαί-

ρετοι ; and it must have run not as it is written by Paul, but : καθὼς οὐκ ἠλπίσαμεν. No, the apostle says : and their giving did not remain within the limits of the hope which we had formed regarding them, but far surpassed these (ἀλλ' ἐαυτοὺς κ.τ.λ.). — ἀλλ' ἐαυτοὺς κ.τ.λ.] *but themselves they gave*, etc. An expression of the highest Christian readiness of sacrifice and liberality, which, by giving up all individual interests, is not only a contribution of *money*, but a *self-surrender*, in the first instance, *to the Lord*, since in fact *Christ* is thereby served, and also to *him* who conducts the work of collection, since he is to the giver the *organ* of Christ. Flatt and Billroth, following Mosheim and Heumann, are wrong in making πρῶτον *before* in the sense : *before I asked them*. This reference is not in the least implied in the immediate context (οὐ καθὼς ἠλπίσ.) ; and if it were, πρῶτον must have had the first place : ¹ ἀλλὰ πρῶτον ἐαυτοὺς ἔδωκαν κ.τ.λ. As the words stand, ἐαυτοὺς has the emphasis of the contrast with οὐ καθὼς ἠλπίς. Bengel also (comp. Schrader) is wrong in thinking that in πρῶτον there is implied *prae munere* : the Macedonians, before they made collection, had first given themselves to the Lord, and then left it to the apostle to determine how large their contribution should be. In that case there must have been inserted καὶ τὰ χρήματα ἡμῶν, or something similar, as a correlative to ἐαυτοὺς πρῶτον τῷ κυρίῳ. It is wrong to find in ἐαυτοὺς the idea merely of *voluntarily*,² *without any summons*, because it is *object* of the verb. It must have run : αὐτοὶ ἐαυτοὺς κ.τ.λ. (comp. i. 9), or without stress on the self-object, ἀφ' ἐαυτῶν. — καὶ ἡμῶν] Paul does not say ἔπειτα ἡμῶν (in opposition to the *usual* opinion that καί stands for ἔπειτα ; so also Rückert), because the surrender to the Lord is not a *prius in time*, but *in degree* : *to the Lord before all, and to us*. So Rom. i. 16, ii. 9, 10. — διὰ θελήμ. θεοῦ] not exactly an expression of *modesty* (Billroth),—for it is only arbitrary to limit it merely to καὶ ἡμῶν (so also Bengel, Ewald),—but added quite according to the requirement of religious feeling : for God has, according to His will, so wrought on their dispositions, that they, etc. Comp. vv. 1, 16.

Ver. 6. *In order that we should exhort Titus*, etc. Comp. ver. 17. εἰς τό with the infinitive is here, as in all passages (see on Rom. i. 20), to be taken, not as *so that* (so usually, and by Winer), but as *telic* : *in order that*. Comp. Kühner, *ad Xen. Anab.* vii. 8. 20. Certainly the παρακαλέσαι ἡμᾶς Τίτον κ.τ.λ. was a *consequence* of the beyond expectation successful course of the matter in Macedonia, in accordance with which Paul might promise himself no less a success among the Corinthians ; but delicately and piously he presents the state of the case, as if this further prosecution of the work of collection, amidst the self-sacrificing liberality of the Macedonians effected by the divine will, had lain in God's *purpose*, and was therefore a consequence that had been *aimed at by God*. This flows from the διὰ θελήμ. θεοῦ immediately preceding. Comp. Hofmann also. Paul sees in the fact, that the divinely-

¹ This also in opposition to Hofmann, who, in consistency with his inappropriate interpretation of κ. οὐ καθ. ἠλπίσ., takes πρῶτον : *without such a thought* (such a hope) *having occurred to me*. Besides, πρῶτον would

not mean “*without*,” but “*before that*,” etc.

² So Hofmann ; whence there would result even a *threefold* expression of the voluntary act, namely : (1) in αὐθαίρετοι ; (2) in κ. οὐ καθ. ἠλπίσ. ; and (3) in ἐαυτοὺς,

willed success of the collecting work in Macedonia has encouraged him to the continuance of it expressed in ver. 6, the fulfilment of the divine counsel and will, which he is thereby serving. — ἵνα]. Design in the παρακαλέσαι, and consequently its contents. — καθὼς προενήρξατο] *as he formerly has begun*, without doubt during his sojourn in Corinth after our first Epistle ; see Introd. § 1. The word is indeed without example elsewhere, but it is formed from ἐνάρχομαι, after the analogy of προάρχω and others. — οὕτω καὶ ἐπιτελέσῃ εἰς ὑμᾶς] *so also might complete it among you*. The emphasis lies, as before on προενήρξατο, so here on ἐπιτελέσῃ. With the verb of rest εἰς associates the thought of the previous arrival, so that ἐλθὼν may for clearness be supplied. See Kühner, § 622 b ; Jacobs, *ad Anthol.* XIII. p. 71 ; Ellendt, *Lex. Soph.* I. p. 537. The correlation of ἐνάρχεσθαι and ἐπιτελεῖν is simply as in Phil. i. 6, Gal. iii. 3 ; we should anticipate (ix. 12) by importing the idea of *sacrifice* (Osiander). — καὶ τὴν χάριν ταύτην] not *hanc quoque gratiam* (Beza, Calvin, comp. Castalio), but : *etiam gratiam istam* (Vulgate). For *also* belongs to τὴν χάριν, not to ταύτην. He shall complete among you—in addition to whatever else he has already begun and has still to complete—*also this benefit*. This better suits the context, namely, the connection of the οὕτω καὶ ἐπιτελ. with καθὼς προενήρξατο, than the interpretation of Estius : “ dicit *etiam*, ut innuat Titum alia quaedam apud ipsos jam perfecisse.” So also Flatt. It is quite superfluous to invoke, with Hofmann, an involution of two sentences in order to explain the double καί. And since καί refers to the activity of Titus, Billroth is wrong in explaining it : “ they are to distinguish themselves in this good deed, as in all things.” — The work of collection is designated as χάρις, for on the side of the givers it was a *showing of kindness*, a work of love, an *opus charitativum*. Observe that here and in vv. 4, 19, θεοῦ is not added, as in ver. 1, ix. 14, according to which Hofmann and older commentators explain it here also of the *divine grace*, of which they are made worthy through the service rendered.

Vv. 7–15. Encouragement to associate with their other Christian excellences distinction also in this work of love, which he says not in the form of a command, but to test their love—for they knew indeed the pattern of love in Christ—and by way of advice (vv. 7–9). For *this* is serviceable *for them*, inasmuch as they had already made the beginning. Now, however, they were not to fail of completing their work, namely, according to their means ; for it was not intended that others should be at ease while they were in want, but that a relation of equality should be established (vv. 10–15).

Ver. 7. Ἀλλ'] is not equivalent to οὖν (Beza and others, also Flatt), nor to *agedum* (Emmerling), but is the Latin *at*, *breaking off* the preceding statement, like the German *doch*. Hermann, *ad Viger.* p. 812, aptly says : “ Saepe indicat, satis argumentorum allatum esse.” Comp. Baeumlein, *Partik.* p. 15. Olshausen has a more far-fetched idea, that it is corrective : *yea rather*. And Billroth imports quite arbitrarily : “ When I entreated Titus, I knew beforehand that this time also you would not deceive me, but that, as you are distinguished in all that is good, so also you would zealously further this collection ;” and Rückert also (similarly Calvin) : “ I

have entreated Titus, etc.; yet let it not happen that he should need first to encourage you (?), yea rather, etc.” According to Hofmann, ἀλλά forms the transition to the οὐ κατ’ ἐπιταγὴν λέγω which follows in ver. 8; but this supposes a very involved construction (comp. afterwards on ἵνα κ.τ.λ.). — ὥσπερ ἐν παντὶ κ.τ.λ.] *as you in every relation are abundant (excellitis) through faith (strength, fervour, and efficacy of faith), and discourse (aptitude in speaking), and knowledge (see regarding both on 1 Cor. i. 5), and every diligence (“studium ad agendas res bonas,” Grotius), and your love to us, so should you abound in showing this kindness.* If πιστεῖ κ.τ.λ. be taken as a specification of ἐν παντί (Luther, Grotius, and most), the meaning is more uncertain, since ἐν is not repeated. Comp. vi. 4; 1 Cor. i. 5; it comes in again only before ταύτη τ. χάρι. Grotius aptly remarks: non ignoravit P. artem rhetorum, movere laudando.” Amidst the general praise, however, he wisely here also leaves the *distingue personas* to the feeling of the readers. — τῇ ἐξ ὑμῶν ἐν ὑμῖν ἀγάπῃ] Paul here conceives the active love as something issuing from the disposition of the person loving, and adhering to the person loved. Thus he *felt* the love of the *Corinthians* to him *in his heart*; comp. vii. 3. This view alone suits the context, inasmuch as the other points mentioned are points purely *subjective*, belonging to the readers, and serving to recommend them; hence we are not to understand it as the love *dwelling in the apostle*, but owing its origin to the readers (Hofmann). Calvin aptly remarks: “Caritatem erga se commemorat, ut personae quoque suae respectu illis addat animos.” On the form of the expression, comp. Winer, p. 181 f. [E. T. 241]. — ἵνα καὶ ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ χάριτι περισσ.] A periphrasis for the imperative, to be explained by supplying a verb of summoning, on which ἵνα depends in the conception of the speakers. See Buttman, p. 208 [E. T. 241]; Fritzsche, *ad Matth.* p. 840, *ad Marc.* p. 179. In the old Greek ὅπως is used in the very same way (*ἵνα* late and seldom, as in Epictetus, *Dissert.* iv. 1. 142). See Matthiae, p. 1187; Viger. ed. Herm. pp. 435, 791 f.; Hartung, *Partikell.* II. p. 148. According to Grotius and Bengel, whom Hofmann follows, the connecting of ἵνα κ.τ.λ. with the following οὐ κατ’ ἐπιταγὴν λέγω would yield no unsuitable sense (in opposition to Rückert); but the construction of the passage in vv. 7 and 8, so as to form one period, would be a construction assumed without sufficient ground, ill-arranged and ambiguous, and would not accord with the apostle’s way of beginning a new sentence by οὐ . . . λέγω in order to guard against an incorrect judgment of the previous one (vii. 3; 1 Cor. iv. 14. Comp. 2. Cor. v. 12). — In καὶ ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ χάριτι, ταύτῃ has the emphasis (it was otherwise in ver. 6); *also in this* showing of kindness, as in other works of beneficence,—which was embraced in ἐν παντί.

Ver. 8. Prudent and yet deeply stirring caveat in reference to what was said in ver. 7. *Not by way of command do I say it, but as, through the diligence of others, testing also the genuine nature of your love.* — διὰ] “aliorum studio vobis commemorato,” Bengel. — ἐτέρων] of members of extraneous churches. — τὸ γνήσιον] *the genuineness.* (x⁵) See Kühner, II. p. 122; Dissen, *ad Pind. Mem.* p. 452. — δοκιμάζειν] is here, too (comp. on 1 Cor. xi. 28), not *probatum reddere* (Chrysostom, Theodoret, Estius), but *explorare*; for by the result, which the setting forth of the *Macedonian* example would

have on the Corinthians, it had to be shown whether, and how far, *their* brotherly love was genuine or not. The *participle* does not depend on ver. 10 (Bengel), but on λέγω, which is to be supplied again after ἀλλά. λέγω with the *participle*: I say it, *inasmuch as I thereby*, etc. Comp. on 1 Cor. iv. 14.

Ver. 9. Parenthesis which states what holy reason he has for speaking to them, not κατ' ἐπιταγήν, but in the way just mentioned, that of *testing their love*. For you know, indeed (γινώσκετε not imperative, as Chrysostom and others think), what a high *pattern* of gracious kindness you have *experienced* in yourselves from Jesus Christ. So the testing, which I have in view among you, will only be *imitation of Christ*. Olshausen rejects here the conception of *pattern*, and finds the proof of *possibility*: "Since Christ by His becoming poor has made you rich, you also *may* communicate of your riches; *He has placed you in a position to do so*." The *outward* giving, namely, presupposes the *disposition* to give as an internal motive, without which it would not take place. But in this view πλουτήσητε would of necessity apply to riches *in loving dispositions*, which, however, is not suggested at all in the context, since in point of fact the consciousness of every believing reader led him to think of the whole fulness of the Messianic blessings as the aim of Christ's humiliation, and to place *in that* the riches meant by πλουτήσητε. — ὅτι δι' ὑμᾶς κ.τ.λ.] *that He for your sakes*, etc., epexegetical of τὴν χάριν τ. κυρ. ἡμ. Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. The emphatic δι' ὑμᾶς brings home to the believing consciousness of the readers *individually* the aim, which in itself was universal. — ἐπτώχευσεν] *inasmuch as He by His humiliation to become incarnate emptied Himself of the participation, which He had in His pre-existent state, of God's glory, dominion, and blessedness* (πλούσιος ὢν), Phil. ii. 6. On the meaning of the word, comp. LXX. Judg. vi. 6, xiv. 15; Ps. xxxiv. 10, lxxix. 8; Prov. xxiii. 21; Tob. iv. 21; Antiphanes in Becker's *Anecd.* 112. 24. The aorist denotes the once-occurring *entrance* into the condition of *being poor*, and therefore certainly the *having become* poor (although πτωχεύειν, as also the classical πενέσθαι, does not mean *to become* poor, but *to be*¹ poor), and not the *whole life* led by Christ in poverty and loneliness, during which He was nevertheless rich in grace, rich in *inward* blessings; so Baur² and Köstlin, *Lehrbegr. d. Joh.* p. 310, also Beyschlag, *Christol.* p. 237. On the other hand, see Rübiger, *Christol. Paul.* p. 38 f.; Neander, ed. 4, p. 801 f.; Lechler, *Apost. Zeit.* p. 50 f.; Weiss, *Bibl. Theol.* pp. 312, 318. — ὢν] is the *imperfect* participle: *when He was rich*, and does not denote the abiding possession (Estius, Rückert); for, according to the context, the apostle is not speaking of what Christ is, but of what He *was*,³ before He became man, and *ceased* to be on His self-exinanition in becoming man (Gal. iv. 4; this also in opposition to Philippi, *Glaubensl.* IV. p. 447). So also ὑπάρχων, Phil. ii. 6. — ἵνα ὑμεῖς . . . πλουτήσητε] in order that *you* through *His* poverty might become *rich*. These riches are the reconciliation,

¹ As e.g. βασιλεύειν, *to be king*, but ἐβασίλευσα: I have *become* king. Comp. 1 Cor. iv. 8; and see in general, Kühner, *ad Xen. Mem.* i. 1. 18; also Ernesti, *Urspr. d. Sünde*, I. p. 245.

² Comp. his *neut. Theol.* p. 193: "though in Himself as respects His *right* rich, He *lived* poor."

³ Comp. Rich. Schmidt, *Paul. Christol.* p. 144.

justification, illumination, sanctification, peace, joy, certainty of eternal life, and hereafter its actual possession, in short, the whole sum of spiritual and heavenly blessings (comp. Chrysostom) which Christ has obtained for believers by His humiliation even to the death of the cross. Πλουτεῖν means with the Greek writers, and in the N. T. (Rom. x. 12 ; Luke xii. 21), to *be* rich ; but the *arist* (1 Cor. iv. 8) is to be taken as with ἐπώχευσε. Ἐκείνον, instead of the simple αὐτοῦ (Krüger, *ad Xen. Anab.* iv. 3. 30 ; Dissen, *ad Dem. de cor.* p. 276, 148), has great emphasis : “*magnitudinem Domini in-nuit*,” Bengel. — In opposition to *the* interpretation of our passage, by which ἐπώχ. falls into the *historical life*, so that πλούσιος ὢν is taken *potentialiter* as denoting the *power* to take to Himself riches and dominion, which, however, Jesus has renounced and has subjected Himself to poverty and self-denial (so Grotius and de Wette), see on Phil. ii. 6.

Ver. 10. After the parenthesis in ver. 9, a continuation of the ἀλλὰ . . . δοκιμάζων, ver. 8 : *and an opinion I give in this affair*. Γνώμην, *opinion*, has the emphasis, as contrasting with ἐπιταγήν in ver. 8. Comp. on 1 Cor. vii. 25. — τοῦτο γὰρ ὑμῖν συμφέρει] συμφέρει does not mean *deceit* (Vorstius, Emmerling, who appeals to LXX. Prov. xix. 10, where, however, the translation is *inaccurate*), but : *it profits*. And τοῦτο is not, with most, including Rückert, de Wette, Ewald, Neander, to be referred to the *supplying of charitable gifts*, in which case συμφέρει is either left without more precise definition (Rückert : “*like every good deed, bringing advantage*”), or is interpreted as pointing to the advantage of good repute (Grotius, comp. also Hofmann), of the divine recompense (Calovius) and the moral advantage (Flatt), or as useful for salvation (Bisping), and so on. Τοῦτο γὰρ ὑμ. συμφ. contains, in fact, the ground why Paul proceeds in this matter merely *by way of advising* ; hence, with Billroth, Osiander, and Kling, τοῦτο is to be referred to the previous γνώμην . . . δίδωμι. It is no objection to this, that in ἐν τούτῳ immediately before the pronoun referred to the distribution. For in the previous clause γνώμην δίδωμι contained the whole thought, and ἐν τούτῳ had no stress laid on it, not even needing to be inserted. Accordingly : *for this*—that I do not command you, but only give my opinion in the matter—*is serviceable to you*, is fitted to operate in the way of moral improvement on you, as being persons who have already shown yourselves to be such as need not command, but only counsel. The *emphasis* lies primarily on τοῦτο and next on ὑμῖν. According to Hofmann, who does not take ver. 9 parenthetically, in καὶ γνώμην κ.τ.λ. there is meant to follow something new and further, so that both ἐν τούτῳ and subsequently τοῦτο point to the advice, which Paul intends to give (*with the following . . . what follows*), and this advice is expressed in the imperative clause ver. 11, to which οἵτινες κ.τ.λ. belongs as a protasis. Against this confusion it may be decisively urged, first, that the ἐν τούτῳ emphatically pointing forward must have been placed first ; secondly, that after δίδωμι there would come not at all the announced γνώμη, but in the first instance an argumentative parenthetical clause, which would again begin with “*what follows*,”—a course which could only lead the reader astray ; thirdly, that if τοῦτο γ. ὑμῖν συμφέρει does not go with οἵτινες κ.τ.λ., and find its more precise explanation therein, it would interpolate a

thought altogether indefinite and isolated ; fourthly, that *δέ* after *νυνί* in ver. 11 most naturally introduces a new sentence ; lastly, that ver. 11 has not in the least the form of a *γνώμη*, of an expression of opinion, but a form purely *praeceptive*, as, indeed, that which the apostle has put under the considerate point of view of a testing and a *γνώμη* in *contrast* to an *ἐπιταγή*, was already contained in ver. 7 and has nothing more to do with the direct precept of ver. 11. — *οἵτινες*] *ut qui*, includes the specifying of the *reason*. See on Eph. iii. 13. *οὐ μόνον τὸ ποιῆσαι, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ θέλαιν*] Grotius, following the Peshitto and Arabic of Erpenius, assumes here a *loquendi genus inversum* ; but this is an irrational violence,¹ to which also the view of Emmerling (comp. *Castalio* in the *Adnot.*) ultimately comes : “*vos haud mora, uno momento facere et velle coepistis.*” The explanation of others² is at least rational : *not only the doing, but also the being willing*, i.e. *the doing willingly*. But that *θέλαιν* is not used in the sense of *θέλοντας ποιεῖν* (see regarding this use of *θέλων*, Markl. *ad Lys.* Reisk. p. 616), or even *θέλαιν ποιῆσαι* (Bremi, *ad Dem. Phil.* i. 13, p. 121), is plain from ver. 11, where Paul, if that meaning had been in his mind, must have continued : *νυνὶ δὲ καὶ ἐπιτελέσατε τὸ π.* But, in the form in which he has written ver. 11, the emphasis lies not on *ἐπιτελέσατε*, but on *τὸ ποιῆσαι*, which is thereby shown to be something not contemporaneous with the *θέλαιν*, but following upon it, something which is still to happen after that *θέλαιν* is already present, so that we have an advance (1) from the *ποιῆσαι* to the *θέλαιν* in ver. 10 ; and (2) from the *θέλαιν* to the further *ποιῆσαι* in ver. 11. Moreover, in opposition to the former interpretation, we may urge the change of tenses in ver. 10 ; for, if the *θέλαιν* in ver. 10 were to be something inherent in the previous *ποιῆσαι* (willingness), the *aorist* infinitive must likewise have been used. Lastly, there is opposed to this interpretation the *ὅπως καθάπερ κ.τ.λ.* in ver. 11, where evidently the (future) actual accomplishment is compared with the inclination of the (present) willing ; hence, in ver. 10 also *θέλαιν* must be conceived of as something which subsists *for itself*, and not simply as *a willingly doing*. Others conceive that *τὸ ποιῆσαι* denotes *the collection-gathering which had already actually taken place*, and *τὸ θέλαιν* *the continuing wish to do still more*. This is in the main the view of Hunnius, Hammond, Wetstein,³ Mosheim, Bengel, Michaelis, Fritzsche. The latter says (*Dissert.* II, p. 9) : “*hoc modo non solum τὸ θέλαιν tanquam gravius τῷ ποιεῖν oppositum est (nam qui nova beneficia veteribus addere vult, plus illo agit, qui in eo quod praestitit, subsistit) sed etiam v. προενάρξασθαι utrique bene congruit, illi (τῷ ποιῆσαι), quoniam nondum tantum pecuniae erogaverant, quantum ad justam λογίαν sufficere videretur, huic (τῷ θέλαιν) quoniam in hac nova voluntate huc usque acquieverant.*” In this way the change of tenses in *ποιῆσαι* and *θέλαιν* would be quite appropriate ; both would apply (this in opposition to Billroth's objection) to the same fact, to

¹ This inversion is followed also by Luther, not in the translation, but in the gloss : “*You have been the first, who willed it and also did it.*”

² Chrysostom, Theodoret, Theophylact, Gregory, Erasmus, Calvin, Beza, Cornelius à Lapide, Clericus, Heumann, Bauer, *Log.*

Paul. p. 334 ; Zachariae, Storr, Rosenmüller, Flatt, Billroth, Schrader, Olshausen, Rückert, Osiander, Ewald, and several others.

³ Who says : “*ποιῆσαι est dare ; θέλαιν ποιῆσαι, i.e. ποιήσεν vel δώσειν, daturum esse.*”

the work of collecting begun in pursuance of 1 Cor. xvi., which, however, would be viewed not according to two different *sides* (Billroth), objective (ποιῆσαι) and subjective (θέλειν), but according to two different *stages*, in respect of the first activity and of the further willing, so that now also the *third* stage, the execution of this further willing, must be added to complete the whole matter, ver. 11. But since there is no indication whatever of the reference of τὸ θέλειν to a *further* willing (following on the ποιῆσαι), and that a willing arrested as to its realization ; and since, on the other hand, the προ in προενήρξ. permits for the climactic relation οὐ μόνον τὸ ποιῆσαι, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ θέλειν only *the* temporal reference, that the θέλειν must have been *earlier* than the ποιῆσαι, and consequently οὐ μόνον . . . ἀλλὰ καί is a climax of time pointing not forward, but *backward* : the view of Fritzsche is to be given up as not accordant with the context. There remains as the only correct view, that of Cajetan and Estius, which de Wette (and after him Winer, p. 521 [E. T. 701 f.], also Wieseler, *Chronol. d. apost. Zeitalt.* p. 364) has defended, that προενήρξ. places the readers in comparison as to time with the *Macedonians* (ver. 1 ff.) : *not only the doing* (the carrying out of the action of collecting), *but also already the willing has begun earlier among you* than among the Macedonians ; you have *anticipated* them in *both* respects. With this view it is obvious that Paul *could not but* logically place ποιῆσαι before θέλειν. The offence, which this arrangement would otherwise occasion, cannot be got over by the pregnant meaning, which Hofmann puts into the *present* θέλειν, viz. that it denotes the *steady attitude of mind sustained up to the execution* (comp. Billroth). This would, in fact, be a *modal definition* of the willing, which Paul would doubtless have known how to *designate*, but could not put into the bare *present*.¹ And such an *attitude of mind* would withal have already existed *before* the ποιῆσαι, and would not simply have come afterwards. — ἀπὸ πέρυσσι] More precise definition of the προ in προενήρξ. : *since the previous year*. On πέρυσσι, *superiore anno*, see Plato, *Protag.* p. 327 C ; *Gorg.* p. 473 E ; Aristoph. *Vesp.* 1044 ; *Acharn.* 348 ; Lucian, *Tim.* 59 ; *Soloecc.* 7, *al.* Comp. ix. 2. Whether did Paul date the beginning of the year after the *Greek* (rather *Attic* and *Olympic*) reckoning (so Credner, *Einl.* I. 2, p. 372), *i.e.* about the time of the summer solstice, or after the *Macedonian* fashion (so, on account of ix. 2, Wieseler, *Chronol. d. apost. Zeitalt.* p. 364), *i.e.* at the autumnal equinox, or from the month Nisan (Hofmann ; see Grimm on 1 Macc. x. 21), or from the usual *national* standpoint of the *Jewish* reckoning, according to which the beginning of the civil year was the month Tisri (in Sept.) ? The last is in itself the most natural, and also the most probable, considering the great variety as to the times of beginning the year, to which he would have had to accommodate himself in the various provinces, and considering not less the acquaintance with the Jewish calendar which he could take for granted in all his churches. Consequently there lies between the composition of our first and second Epistles the time from Easter till at least after the beginning of the new year in Tisri.

¹ The *present* denotes simply the *being* disposed as the *habitus* of readiness prevailing in the case, by way of distinction from the historical *doing* (ποιῆσαι), through which the θέλειν became active.

Ver. 11. The *καί* before *τὸ ποιῆσαι* can only belong to it, and not to *ἐπιτελ.* also (de Wette, Hofmann). It is the simple accessory *also*; as in ver. 10 the thought proceeded backwards from doing to willing, now it proceeds forwards from willing to doing, so that at the bottom of *καὶ τὸ ποιῆσαι* there lies the conception: Now, however, bring *not merely the willing, but also the doing* to completion. (z⁵) This is an analysis of the elements, which in reality coincide (for the *ἐπιτελέσαι* of the willing is the *actual execution*), occasioned, however, very naturally by the juxtaposition in ver. 10, and giving rise to no misconception here. — *ὅπως καθάπερ κ.τ.λ.*] in order that as the *inclination* of the willing, so also the *completion* (of that, which ye will) *may be according to means, i.e.* in order that the actual execution of that, which you will, may not remain out of proportion to the inclination of your will, but, like the latter, may be accordant with your means. As it is the inclination of your will to contribute according to the standard of your possessing, the execution of this willingness should take place according to the same standard. — *οὕτω καὶ τὸ ἐπιτελέσαι*] *sc. ἥ.* The supplying the subjunctive of *εἶμι* is not linguistically inadmissible (Rückert), and is found already in Homer (*Il.* i. 547, and Nägelsb. *in loc.*), but it is certainly rare in Greek writers. Comp. ver. 13. See Bernhardt, p. 330 f; Buttmann, *neut. Gramm.* p. 120 [E. T. 137]. — *ἐκ τοῦ ἔχειν*] belongs to both subjects of the clause of purpose: *in pursuance of the having*, according to your means. See Fritzsche, *Quaest. Luc.* p. 179 f. Comp. expressions like *ἐκ τῶν παρόντων*, *ἐκ τῶν ὑπαρχόντων*, and the like. *Ἐκ* is not to be taken in the sense of the origin, as Hofmann wishes; for it would, in fact, be an indelicate and bad compliment to the inclination of the readers, that it had “originated” from their possession. Paul himself indicates afterwards by *καθό* in what meaning he uses *ἐκ*.

Ver. 12. Confirmation of the *ἐκ τοῦ ἔχειν* by a general proposition. There is nothing to be supplied except the simple *ἐστὶ* after *εὐπρόσδεκτος*, so that *ἡ προθυμία* remains the subject (Vulg., Erasmus, and others, including Rückert, Osiander, Ewald). It is quite superfluous *mentally to supply* the non-genuine *τις* after *ἔχῃ*, and to refer *εὐπρόσδ.* to it (Billroth), all the more that Paul is fond of personifying abstractions (*ἡ προθυμία*). The correct translation is: *For, if the inclination exists* (presents itself as existing), *it is well-pleasing in proportion to that which it has, not in proportion to that which it has not, i.e.* God measures His good pleasure according to that which the *πρόθυμος* (who is ready to contribute) possesses, not according to that which he does not possess.¹ If, for example, the poor man who is ready to give little, because he has not much, were less pleasing to God than the rich man, who is willing to give much, God would then determine His good pleasure according to what the *πρόθυμος* does *not* possess. Such an unjust standard God does not apply to good will! *οὐ γὰρ τὴν ποσότητα, ἀλλὰ τῆς γνώμης ὁρᾷ τὴν ποιότητα*, Theodoret. On *πρόκειται* in the sense specified, see Kypke, II. p. 259, and from Philo, Loesner, p. 312. Comp. *ταράσσεται*, Rom. vii. 18. The interpretation *prius adest*, namely, *tanquam boni operis fundamentum* (Erasmus,

¹ An evangelical commentary on this sentence is the story of the widow's mite, Mark xii. 42 ff.; Luke xxi. 2 ff.

Beza, Estius, and others), is not supported by linguistic usage, and there is no hint in the context of a reference to time. Flatt imports “*unpleasing*” into the negative half of the sentence ; and Hofmann goes still further, since he finds in *πρόκειται* the *realization* of the good will, and attaches to *this* (not to *εὐπρόσδ.*) the *καθὸ ἐὰν ἔχῃ*, while he thereupon adds the supplementary words *οὐ καθὸ οὐκ ἔχει* so as to form the sentence : “*that is not the condition of the acceptableness of the good will, that it is present as realized according to the measure of what it has not.*” In this way we should have mentally to add *εἰ πρόκειται* after *οὐ* ; and Paul would not only have made use of a fragmentary mode of expression as unintelligibly as possible, but would withal have supposed an inconceivable case, namely, that the good will is realized according to the measure of *non-possession*, which is tantamount to saying that the good will *gives what it has not*. And the assumption that *πρόκειται* denotes already the *realization* of the *προθυμία* by the act, is the more erroneous, that the one *before whom* the *προθυμία* is laid is here *God*, as is shown by *εὐπρόσδεκτος*. God, however, looks on the heart, and the frame of mind itself *lies open before Him*. — Note further the difference between the conditioned *καθὸ ἐὰν ἔχῃ*, in proportion to what he, under the respective circumstances of each case (*ἐὰν* = *ἂν*), *may have*, and the unconditioned *καθὸ οὐκ ἔχει*. Comp. Hartung, *Partikell.* II. p. 293 f. ; Klotz, *ad Devar.* p. 143.

Ver. 13. Confirmation of the previous *οὐ καθὸ οὐκ ἔχει* from the aim of the present collection. — The words usually supplied after *οὐ γάρ* (Beza, Flatt, and others : *hoc dico* ; Erasmus and Grotius : *sic dandum est* ; Rosenmüller and Fritzsche, *ad Rom.* p. 48 : *volo* ; comp. Osiander ; Rückert has *γίνεται τοῦτο*, comp. Ewald, and previously Luther) are superfluous, and therefore to be rejected. There is nothing to be supplied but *ἢ* after *θλίψις* and *γίνεται* (see ver. 14) at the end of the verse : *for not in order that there may be to others refreshing, to you distress, but on a footing of equality at the present time your superfluity reaches to the lack of those*, is applied to remedy their lack. The punctuation is to be corrected accordingly. Since the sentence in this way flows logically and grammatically without any obstacle, there is not to be placed after *θλίψις* (Beza, Elzevir, Flatt, and many others), or yet even after *ισότητος* (Griesbach, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Rückert, de Wette, Osiander, and others), any colon, by which, moreover, *ἐν τῷ νῦν καιρῷ* would receive an emphasis not justified by any contrast, and would come in very abruptly, having no connecting particle. — *ἄλλοις*] means the Christians in Jerusalem. The same are afterwards meant by *ἐκείνων*. Probably opponents in Corinth had said : “he wishes to fleece us and bring us to want, that others may have good times or the like.” — On the contrast of *ἄνεσις* and *θλίψις*, comp. 2 Thess. i. 6 f. The asyndeton : *ἄλλοις ἄνεσις, ὑμῖν (δέ is not genuine) θλίψις* presents the contrast more vividly. Paul, however, uses *ἄλλοις*, not *ἐτέροις* (as in ver. 8), because he has been thinking of *others* generally, other persons than the *readers*. — *ἐξ ισότητος*] *ἐκ*, as in ver. 11, used of *the standard*. The establishment of equality (between you and others) is the norm, according to which, etc. — *ἐν τῷ νῦν καιρῷ*] awakens the thought of a future, where the state of the case might be reversed. See ver. 14. Hofmann thinks that Paul had here in view the *definite* inversion of the situation *in such wise*, that after Israel's

conversion (iii. 16) there would be in the Holy Land a Christian church under more prosperous fortunes than the body of Gentile Christians then sorely tried. But this is not to be made good by 2 Thess. ii. 3, and it has against it Rom. xi. 25, according to which, before the conversion of Israel will ensue, the whole Gentile world must first be converted, and accordingly Paul could hardly have thought of casual collections from Judaea as then either necessary or effectual for the Gentiles (apart altogether from the expected nearness of the Parousia). — On *γίνεσθαι εἰς*, *to come unto, reach towards, be apportioned to* (Plato, *Tim.* p. 57 A ; Luc. *Caucas*, 19, *al.*), comp. on Gal. iii. 14.

Ver. 14. f. *In order that* (divine purpose), if the circumstances change, the converse case may also set in, and *the superfluity of those be imparted to your lack*. On account of ver. 13 we must, in accordance with the context, think also here of *something earthly*, not (as Jerome, Chrysostom, Theodoret, Theophylact, Anselm, the R. Catholics, ¹ Bengel, Michaelis, Schrader wish) of *spiritual* blessings—which would be unhistorical, and quite opposed to the standpoint of the apostle to the Gentiles. According to Paul, the participation of the Gentiles in the spiritual blessings of the Jewish Christians had already *taken place* through the *conversion* of the former, Rom. xv. 27. — *ὅπως γένηται ἰσότης*] *in order that* (according to the divine purpose *equality might set in*, since, namely, then they will not have too much and you too little, if their superfluity shall come to the help of your lack. (A⁵) According to Hofmann, *ἰσότης* amounts here to the idea of the *inversion* of the relation, which, however, does not agree with ver. 15, and has against it the clear reference of the meaning of *ἐξ ἰσότης* in ver. 13. The idea of *brotherly equalization*, which Paul had expressed by *ἐξ ἰσότης* as regulative for the present case in ver. 13, he repeats also for the eventual future case in ver. 14: it is to him of so much importance. And so important was it to the primitive church generally, that it even produced at first in Jerusalem the community of goods. — *καθὼς γέγραπται*] A confirmation from Scripture of this idea, which is to realize itself in the two cases, ver. 13 and ver. 14. It is already typically presented in the gathering of the manna, Ex. xvi. 18 (freely quoted after the LXX.). The quotation refers therefore not simply to ver. 14, but to vv. 13 and 14, since in both there prevails the same fundamental thought. — *ὁ τὸ πολὺ*] *he who much*, namely, *had gathered*, as in Ex. *l.c.*, we must supply from the context (ver. 17). Paul presupposes that his readers are aware of the reference and of the connection of the passage. — *οὐκ ἐπλεόνασε*] *had not too much*, not more than was appointed by God for his needs ; *τὸ γὰρ μέτρον ὁ μεγαλόδωρος τῷ δώρῳ συνέξενε*, Theodoret. See Ex. xvi. 16 f. In the same way : *οὐκ ἠλαττόνησε*, *he had not too little*. The word, frequent in the LXX., is foreign to Greek writers. — The *articles* denote the two definite and well-known cases which occurred in the gathering.

¹ These misused the passage against Protestants in this way : "*Locus hic apostoli contra nostrae aetatis haereticos ostendit, posse Christianos minus sanctos meritis sanctorum adjuvari etiam in futuro saeculo*," Estius.

See, on the contrary, Calovius. Bisping also thinks of *prayers, merits of good works*, and the like, which love may give for temporal gifts received.

Vv. 16-24. Regarding Titus, already mentioned in ver. 6, and the two others, who were sent with Titus as delegates to Corinth about the collection.

Ver. 16. Δέ] continuative. — χάρις τῷ θεῷ, τῷ διδόντι κ.τ.λ.] language of the deeply religious consciousness (1 Cor. xv. 10 ; Rom. vi. 17 ; Phil. ii. 13). Comp. ver. 1. The *present* participle ; for the continuing zeal is continually given by God. (B⁶) — τὴν αὐτὴν σπουδ.] namely, *as in me*. This reference is made necessary by ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν, by which Billroth's explanation : "the same zeal, *which you have for the good cause*," is excluded. — ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ.] See on ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις, ver. 1.

Ver. 17. Proof of this σπουδῇ of Titus. — *For the summons indeed he received ; but, seeing that he was more zealous, of his own accord he set out to you.* Paul has not expressed himself incorrectly, seeing that he can only have had in his mind a climax (Rückert) ; nor has he used μὲν . . . δέ in the sense of the climactic οὐ μόνον . . . ἀλλά (Billroth, also Flatt) ; but the concessive clause τὴν μὲν παράκλησιν ἐδέξατο expresses the delicate modesty and subordination of Titus, according to which he would not have it appear that he set out on the journey αὐθαίρετος ; the second clause, on the other hand, sets forth the actual state of the case. *The summons (ver. 6) indeed he received ;* he did not say as it were : there is no need of thy summons, I go of my own impulse ; *but* in the actual state of the case he was *too zealous* to have needed a summons, *and set out to you of his own self-determination.* — ἐξηλθε] The *praeterite* does not denote *what was resolved on* (Billroth), but is that of the *epistolary style* (comp. συνεπέμψ., vv. 18, 22 ; Xen. *Anab.* i. 9. 25), used to represent the point of time at which the letter is read by those receiving it. Comp. Acts xv. 27, xxiii. 30, also on Gal. vi. 11.

Ver. 18. Recommendation of the first companion of Titus. — συνεπέμψ. δὲ μετ' αὐτοῦ] The σύν refers, like μετ' αὐτοῦ, to *Titus* : *we have sent along with him.* Comp. ver. 22. See Lobeck, *ad Phryn.* p. 354. Comp. Gal. ii. 12 ; Acts i. 26, xxv. 12 ; Matt. xvii. 3. Bengel takes it incorrectly : "una misimus ego et Timotheus," which is contained in the *plural*, but not in the compound. — τὸν ἀδελφόν κ.τ.λ.] is understood by Heumann and Rückert of an *actual* brother, viz. a brother of *Titus*. But ἀδελφοὶ ἡμῶν in ver. 23 shows that Paul has here and in ver. 22 f. taken ἀδελφός in the sense of *Christian* brotherhood. It would not have been in keeping with the *prudence* of the apostle to send with Titus the very brother of the latter and even his own brother (according to Rückert's view of τ. ἀδελφ. ἡμ., ver. 22). *Who* is meant, remains quite an open question. Some have conjectured *Barnabas* (τινὲς in Chrysostom, and Chrysostom himself, Theodoret, Occumenius, Luther, Calvin, and others) or *Silas* (Baronius, Estius) ; but the *rank* of these was not consistent with the position of a companion subordinate to *Titus* ; nor is there anywhere a trace of Barnabas and Paul having ever united again for common work after their separation (Acts xv. 39). Others (comp. also the usual subscription of the Epistle) think that it was *Luke*.¹ But from the

¹ So Origen, τινὲς in Chrysostom, Jerome, Ambrosiaster, Pelagius, Primasius, Anselm, Cajetan, Cornelius à Lapide, and others,

including Grotius, Emmerling, Schrader, Olshausen, Köhler (*Abfassungszeit*, p. 85), of whom those named *before Grotius* referred

very brief statement of Acts xx. 1 ff. there is no proof to be drawn either *for* (Olshausen) or *against* (Rückert) ; and Ignatius, *ad Ephes.* (interpol.) 16, to which Emmerling, after Salmeron and others, has again appealed, proves nothing further than that this unknown author either referred or merely applied our passage to Luke. The conjecture which points to *Eras-tus* (Ewald, following Acts xix. 22 ; 2 Tim. iv. 20) cannot be made good. With just as little proof some have thought of *Mark* (Lightfoot, *Chron.* p. 118 ; Storr, *Opusc.* II. p. 339 ; Tobler, *Evangelienfr.* p. 12). The *result* remains : *we do not know who it was*. So much only in reference to the two persons indicated here and in ver. 22, and in opposition to the conjectures adduced, is clear from ver. 23, that they were not fellow-labourers in the apostolic work, like Titus, but other Christians of distinction.¹ See on ver. 23. Against this *non liquet* Rückert indeed objects, that in that case the Corinthians would not have known which of the two was meant to be here designated, since in ver. 23 both are called ἀπόστολοι ἐκκλησιῶν, by which all distinction is precluded. But this first companion is in ver. 19 so distinctively indicated as appointed *by a special elective act of the churches concerned*, and appointed just for this particular work, that he could not be unknown by name to the Corinthians, after Titus had already begun there the work of collection (ver. 6). Besides, Paul might leave all further information to Titus. — οὗ ὁ ἔπαινος κ.τ.λ.] *i.e. who possesses his praise* (that duly belonging to him) *in the gospel* (in the cause of the gospel, in confessing, furthering, preaching, defending it, and the like), *spread through all the churches*, throughout the whole Christian body. He was a Christian worthy of trust and praised by all.

Ver. 19. As στελλόμενοι in ver. 20 is connected with συνεπέμψαμεν in ver. 18, ver. 19 is a *parenthesis* (Beza, Lachmann) in which Paul “generali testimonio subjungit speciale, quod praesenti negotio congruit,” Calvin. — οὐ μόνον δέ] *sc. ἐπαινούμενος* (or ἐπαινός, *praised*, or ἔνδοξος, or the like) ἐστι ἐν τῷ εὐαγγ. διὰ πασ. τῶν ἐκκλησ.² Comp. Rom. ix. 10, v. 3, 11, viii. 23. — ἀλλὰ καὶ χειροτονηθεὶς κ.τ.λ.] *but also having been chosen by the* (collecting) *churches as our travelling companion*, etc. The χειροτ. ὑπὸ τ. ἐκκλ. contains a point so important in its bearing that we may not take it *parenthetically*, thereby breaking up the flow of the discourse. So Hofmann, assigning the incorrect reason, moreover, that the *perfect* participle must have been used. The perfect *might* be used ; but the aorist expresses the *act done*, whereby the person concerned *became* ἀπόστολος of the churches in this case (ver. 23), and so Paul has *conceived of* it here.—The ἐκκλησίαι here meant are, according to

ἐν τῷ εὐαγγ. to the Gospel of Luke (at that time not yet even in existence).

¹ Hence also we can hardly think of *Trophimus* (de Wette, Wieseler), Acts xx. 4, xxi. 29 ; nor, with Hofmann, of *Aristarchus*, Acts xix. 29, xx. 4.

² Buttmann, *neut. Gr.* p. 252 [E. T. 292], takes it differently : “who *stands in repute*, not only on this account (ἐν τῷ εὐαγγ., *i.e.* as a preacher of the gospel), but also as one elected by the churches.” But from the

general ἐν τῷ εὐαγγ. to χειροτονηθ. there is no logical climax, as respects the specifying of a reason for the ἔπαινος ; whereas the predication ascends from the universal praise of the man to his being elected by the churches—so as to assign a ground for the συνεπέμψαμεν. Besides, his being elected was not the ground, but a consequence of his general repute, although it was the special ground for Paul's sending him to Corinth.

ver. 1 ff., the *Macedonian*. — χειροτον.] *suffragiis designatus*. How this election was conducted, we do not know. Perhaps by the presbyters as representatives of the churches, and on the proposal of the apostle. Comp. on Acts xiv. 23. — ἐν τῇ χάριτι κ.τ.λ.] a more precise definition of the συνεκδ. ἡμῶν. It does not, however, simply mean : *in the bringing over* (Billroth ; this arbitrary limitation was produced by the reading σύν), but in general : *in matters of this χάρις, i.e. in the prosecution, in the whole bringing about, of this kindness* (this work of love), *which is ministered by us*, is effected through our ministry (comp. iii. 3). — πρὸς τὴν τοῦ Κυρίου δόξαν κ.τ.λ.] is connected by *most* (including Theodoret, Beza, Grotius, Estius, Billroth, de Wette, Ewald, Neander) with τῇ διακον. ὑφ. ἡμ. But since in this way πρὸς (which is not, with Ewald, to be taken as *according to*, comp. i. 20) would have to combine two quite different relations : “in order to *promote* Christ’s honour and to prove our *good-will* ;” and since, moreover, the latter element would be self-evident, tame, and superfluous,—we ought rather, with Chrysostom (who, however, reads ὑμῶν instead of ἡμῶν) to construe with χειροτονηθεὶς κ.τ.λ. : elected, etc., *in order to further Christ’s honour and our good-will*. The election of this brother had as its object, that by his co-operation in this matter Christ should be honoured¹ and our desire and love for the work should not be lessened “*ob metum reprehensionis illius, de qua mox loquitur*” (Bengel), but should be maintained and advanced by freedom from such hindering anxiety, and by a fellow-worker thus authorized. The connection with χειροτονηθεὶς κ.τ.λ., which Hofmann, attaching it also to συνεκδ. ἡμῶν, declares to be impossible (why ?), places the election, which had primarily a *business* motive, under the *higher ethical* point of view.

Ver. 20. Στελλόμενοι τοῦτο] goes along with συνεπέμψαμεν in ver. 18. We have sent also the brother, who is honoured by all, and in addition has been chosen by the churches as our associate in this matter, *inasmuch as we thereby avoid this, that no one*, etc. Rückert (comp. de Wette) arbitrarily, because with unnecessary harshness, holds that Paul has abandoned the construction, and instead of writing στελλόμεθα γάρ, has put the participle, because he had had in his mind the thought : “I have caused him to be elected.” Hofmann connects it in an abnormal construction with προθυμ. ἡμῶν, which in itself would be admissible (see on i. 7), but cannot suit here, because πρὸς τ. προθυμ. ἡμ. was a definition of the aim contemplated not by Paul, but by the χειροτονήσαντες ; the connection would be illogical.—According to linguistic usage, στελλόμενοι τοῦτο (see Kypke, *Obs.* II. p. 259 f., 344 ; Schott on 2 Thess. p. 271) may mean : (1) *making this arrangement*² (so, in

¹ Rückert, though following likewise our mode of connection, holds that to the δόξα κυρίου this companionship could only have contributed *negatively*, in so far as it was a precaution against any suspicion falling on the apostle, which suspicion—according to a mode of view also Pauline—would have been transferred to Christ. Why, then, not *positively* also? The brother had in fact been chosen as a travelling associate co-

operating in the work of collection, so that by his election the work might be prosecuted more extensively and more successfully. And thus the choice of this brother served *positively* to glorify Christ ; hence also πρὸς . . . δόξαν is not to be held, with de Wette, as “rather unsuitable.”

² In this case τοῦτο would not have to be taken as equivalent to ἐπὶ τοῦτο (*preparing ourselves for this*), but as simple accusative

the main, Kypke, Rückert, Hofmann), in which case there is not brought out any significant bearing of the words, and besides, the *aorist* participle could not but be expected; or (2) *inasmuch as we draw back from this, shrink from and avoid this* (Hesychius: *στέλλεσθαι φοβεῖσθαι*); so Chrysostom, Theophylact, Luther, and most, following the Itala and Vulgate: “devitantes,” Gothic: “bivandjandans.” Comp. LXX. Mal. ii. 5. The latter is to be preferred as most appropriate in the connection, and agreeing with 2 Thess. iii. 6. The reading *ὑποστελλόμενοι* in F G is a correct gloss. Paul in his humility and practical wisdom did not deem it beneath his dignity to obviate calumnies. — *τοῦτο*] would in itself be superfluous, but it serves as an emphatic preparation for the following *μή τις κ.τ.λ.* See Winer, p. 152 [E. T. 200]. — *μή τις ἡμᾶς μωμήσ.*] *μή* after the notion of anxiety (Baeumlein, *Partik.* p. 288), which lies in *στελλόμεν.*: *that no one may reproach us* (as if we were embezzling, not dealing conscientiously with the distribution, and the like) *in this abundance.* — *ἐν*] *in puncto* of this abundance. Comp. *ἐν τῷ εὐαγγ.*, ver. 18; *ἐν τῇ χάρι.*, ver. 19. — *ἀδρότης*, from *ἀδρός*, *dense*, *thick*, means in Homer (*Il.* xxii. 263, xvi. 857, xxiv. 6): “habitus corporis firma et succulenta,” Duncan, *lex.*, ed. Rost, p. 20. Afterwards it occurs in all relations of the adjective, as in reference to plants and fruits (Theophr., Herod. i. 17), to speech (Diog. Laert. x. 83), to tone (Athen. x. p. 415 A), to snow (Herod. iv. 31), etc. Hence *what* abundance is meant, is determined solely by the context. Here: *abundance of charitable gifts.* According to Wetstein, Zosimus has it also four times “pro ingenti largitione.” Rückert’s proposal to understand it of *the great zeal of the contributors*, which was produced through the apostle’s ministry (*τῇ διακ. ὑφ’ ἡμῶν*), would only be admissible in the event of there being anything in the context about such zeal. As it is, however, *ἐν τῇ ἀδρ. ταύτῃ* is in substance the same as *ἐν τῇ χάριτι ταύτῃ* in ver. 19. Comp. ver. 3.

Ver. 21. Ground of this precautionary measure. *For our anxiety is directed to what is good, not merely before the Lord, not merely so that we set before us God in this way (Prov. iii. 4), but also before men.* Comp. on Rom. xii. 17. Were it merely the former, we should not need such precautionary measures, since to God we *πεφανερώμεθα*, v. 11; but “propter alios fama necessaria est,” Augustine. (c⁶) The misuse of the latter consideration is guarded against by *ἐνώπ. κυρίου.* — *προνοεῖν*, *prospicere*, also in the *active*; comp. Plato, *Clit.* p. 408 E; Xen. *Mem.* ii. 10. 3; Aelian, *V. H.* ii. 21; Wisd. vi. 7; Hesych.: *προνοεῖ ἐπιμελεῖται.* — For analogous Rabbinical sayings, see Wetstein.

Ver. 22. Commendatory mention of the second companion. — *αὐτοῖς*] with Titus and the brother already spoken of. — *τὸν ἀδελφ. ἡμ.*] This one, too, we do not know by name. *Ἡμῶν* does not point to him as in *official* relation to the apostle and Timothy, but denotes him as a *Christian brother* (see ver. 23), so that the *ἡμῶν* embraces also the readers. Conjecture has lighted (but see previously on ver. 18) on *Epaenetus*, Rom. xvi. 5 (Grotius), on *Apollos*

(Thomas, Lyra, and mentioned already in Theodoret) on *Luke* (Calvin and also Estius, who, however, does not discountenance the conjecture of *Zenas*, Tit. iii. 13, and *Sosthenes*), and even on Timothy (Cajetan) and others. Wieseler (comp. on ver. 18) understands it of *Tychicus*, and to this Hofmann also is inclined. The very plural ἡμῶν should have precluded Rückert from thinking of an *actual brother* of the apostle; see also on ver. 18. — ἐν πολλοῖς πολλάκις] goes with ἔδοκ.: *in many things many times*. See on this collocation, Lobeck, *Paral.* p. 56. — νυνὶ δὲ πολὺ σπουδαιότερον πεποιθ. κ.τ.λ.] νυνὶ stands in contrast with the previous ἔδοκιμ. ἐν πολλοῖς πολλάκις: *now, however, as much more zealous* (than in the earlier cases) *through the great confidence which he reposes in you*. A high degree of good confidence in you has now increased very much his zeal. Others understand πεποιθήσει κ.τ.λ. of *Paul's* confidence, connecting it *either* with πολὺ σπουδαίωτ. (Erasmus, Beza, Piscator, and others) or with συνεπέψαμεν (Estius, Emmerling: “*sperans ut bene a vobis excipiantur*”). The latter is an inappropriate departure from the order of the words, depriving πολὺ σπουδαιότερον of the ground assigned for it (and how delicately is its ground assigned by this very πεποιθ. κ.τ.λ.); and the former must necessarily have been denoted by a personal pronoun added to πεποιθ.

Ver. 23 f. Summary closing recommendation of all the three delegates. — εἴτε ὑπὲρ Τίτου] *sc. λέγω or γράφω*. *Be it that I speak on behalf of Titus, he is my associate and* (especially) *in regard to you my fellow-worker*, and my intercession is thus made with good reason. — εἴτε ἀδελφοὶ ἡμῶν] *be it that they are brothers of ours*, namely, for whom I speak, *they are delegates of churches*,¹ *an honour to Christ*, people, whose personal character and working redound to Christ's honour. The words to be supplied with εἴτε in both cases would occur of themselves to the reader of the incomplete passage. Comp. Fritzsche, *ad Rom.* III. p. 47 f. Observe, however, that ἀδελφοὶ ἡμῶν is *predicative*, and therewith *qualitative*; hence the absence of the article appears to be strictly regular,² denoting the category to which the subjects meant in this second half of the verse belong, and therefore neither unsuitable (Rückert) nor yet erroneous (Buttmann, *neut. Gr.* p. 76 [E. T. 87]; comp. Hofmann). — ἡμῶν] as in ver. 22. The distinguishing of the two others from Titus, who holds a higher position, by the qualitative ἀδελφοὶ ἡμῶν, shows that ἀδελφοί are not *official associates*. Such a one *Titus* was; the two others, however, were only distinguished church-members—as it were, *lay brothers* commissioned *ad hoc*, the one by the churches, the other by Paul.

¹ In so far as they did not come as private persons, but as *agents in the business of the church*, as which they were appointed partly by destination of the apostle (namely, the second of the brethren), partly by the choice of the Macedonian churches (the first of the brethren, ver. 18 f.).

² This absence of the article has led Hofmann wrongly to take all the nominatives in ver. 23 as *subjects*, but ὑπὲρ Τίτου as a parenthesis (“*which holds true of Titus*”), and then οὖν in ver. 24 as the οὖν of the

apodosis. A groundless artificial construction, in which the awkward and unprecedented parenthesis (Paul would have said something like Τίτον δὲ λέγω, and that after συνεργός, comp. 1 Cor. x. 29; John vi. 71) would be simply superfluous in the highest degree, since, if κοινωνὸς κ.τ.λ. is the subject, the person thereby indicated would be self-evident. Just as uncalled for here after the short alleged protasis would be the epanaleptic οὖν of the apodosis. Comp. on Rom. ii. 17–24.

Ver. 24. According to the *Recepta*, ἐνδείξασθε is here a *direct* exhortation, in conformity with the points adduced in ver. 23 (οὖν), to furnish towards those three (εἰς αὐτούς) the demonstration (τὴν ἐνδ.) of their love, etc., which demonstration of love is shown to the churches that were represented by them (εἰς πρόσωπ.). Since, however, the *Recepta* is a gloss (see the critical remarks), and ἐνδεικνύμενοι is the correct reading, we have here an *indirect* exhortation, which puts the matter as a point of honour, and so touches the readers more effectively, without directly making a demand on them. "When you accordingly show *towards them* the demonstration of your love and of what we have boasted regarding you, you do it *in presence of the churches*." In this way εἰς αὐτούς and εἰς πρόσωπον τῶν ἐκκλ. emphatically correspond with each other, and after the participle ἐνδεικν. the second person of the present indicative of the same verb is to be supplied. Comp. Soph. O. C. 520 ; El. 1428 (1434) : τὰ πρὶν εὖ θέμενοι τὰδ' ὥς πάλιν, sc. εὖ θῆσθε. See Schneidewin *in loc.*, and, in general, Doederl. *de brachyl.* 1831, p. 10 f. ; also Dissen, *ad Dem. de Cor.* 190, p. 359. We might also simply supply the imperative ἐστέ with ἐνδεικν. (see on Rom. xii. 9), so that also with this reading there would be a *direct*, stern summons. But with the former interpretation the contextually appropriate emphasis of εἰς πρόσωπον τῶν ἐκκλ. comes out more strongly and more independently. — On points of detail we may further observe—(1) The οὖν does not draw the inference simply from the second half of ver. 23, but from both halves, since the exclusion of reference to Titus is not warranted by εἰς πρόσωπ. τ. ἐκκλ., which, in fact, suits all *three* together, and ἡμῶν καυχσέως κ.τ.λ. includes specially a glance at the apostle's relation to Titus ; comp. ver. 6, vii. 14. (2) Πρόσωπον is here also not (see on i. 11) *person*, which would be against the usage of the N. T., and, besides, in the singular would be unsuitable here ; but εἰς πρόσωπον means *to the face*, i.e. *coram* in the sense of the *direction*. The conception, namely, which Paul wishes to excite in the minds of his readers, is this, that in those three men they have to think of the churches themselves, whose instruments these men are in the matter of the collection, as *present* and as *witnesses* of the demonstrations of love that fall to the share of the representatives, and to measure their demeanour towards them accordingly. According to this view, every evidence of love, which is shown to these men, comes, when it takes place, *before the eyes of the churches* (ideally present in the case). The churches stand by and look on. (3) τῆς ἀγάπης ὑμ. is not the love *to Paul* (Grotius, Billroth, de Wette, Ewald, and others, following Chrysostom and Theophylact), but *the Christian brotherly love*, which thereupon has its definite object marked out by εἰς αὐτούς. — On τὴν ἐνδειξιν ἐνδεικνυσθαι, comp. Plat. *Legg.* 12, p. 966 B. The demonstration of the *boasting* : namely, how *true* it was. Comp. vii. 14.

NOTES BY AMERICAN EDITOR.

(v^b) "Deep poverty." Ver. 2.

That this phrase is not a figure of speech appears from what is said in Arnold's "Roman Commonwealth" : "The condition of Greece in the time of Augustus was one of desolation and distress. . . . It had suffered severely by

being the seat of the successive civil wars between Cæsar and Pompey, between the Triumvirs and Brutus and Cassius, and lastly, between Augustus and Antonius. Besides, the country had never recovered from the long series of miseries which had succeeded and accompanied its conquest by the Romans ; and between those times and the civil contest between Pompey and Cæsar, it had been again exposed to all the evils of war when Sylla was disputing the possession of it with the general of Mithridates. . . . The provinces of Macedonia and Achaia, when they petitioned for a diminution of their burdens in the reign of Tiberius, were considered so deserving of compassion that they were transferred for a time from the jurisdiction of the Senate to that of the Emperor" [as involving less heavy taxation].

(v⁵) "*Singleness of heart.*" Ver. 2.

Dr. Meyer adheres to the original and natural meaning of the word, which, however, both in the A. V. and in the Revision, is rendered "liberality," and justly, if a single word is to be employed. Doubtless it expresses both the quality and the quantity of the gifts, or it may be that the generic term is employed for one of its specific manifestations.

(w⁵) "*(They gave) of their own accord.*" Ver. 3.

The Authorized Version renders this clause, "*they were* willing of themselves" ; but this is not what the Apostle says. He speaks not of will, but of deed, and the correct rendering, quoted above and found in the Revision, is sustained by all authorities.

(x⁵) "*The sincerity of your love.*" Ver. 8.

Almsgiving, in obedience to a command or to satisfy conscience, is not an act of liberality. What is not spontaneous is not liberal. Paul therefore would not coerce the Corinthians by a command. The real test of the genuineness of any inward affection is not so much the character of the feeling as it reveals itself in our consciousness, as the course of action to which it leads. Many persons, if they judge themselves by their feelings, would regard themselves as truly compassionate ; but a judgment founded on their acts would lead to the opposite conclusion (Hodge).

(y⁵) "*Became poor.*" Ver. 9.

Dr. Meyer is undoubtedly right in rendering the verb thus, and in explaining it to refer not to our Lord's outward poverty during his earthly life, but to the *kenosis*, the self-impoverishment in laying aside the glory of His divine majesty. Indeed, the connection requires this, for what Paul quotes the case for is not Christ's remaining in the poverty He had on earth, but His relinquishing the riches He had in heaven, and a similar renunciation was what He asked of the Corinthians.

(z⁵) "*Perform the doing of it.*" Ver. 11.

This awkward and tautologous expression is well replaced in the Revision by the more accurate "complete the doing of it."

(A⁶) “*That there may be equality.*” Ver. 14.

This is not communism. The New Testament teaches (1) that all giving is voluntary. A man's property is his own. It is indeed a moral duty for him to give to the needy, but this is one of those duties which others cannot enforce as a right belonging to them. (2) The end of giving is to relieve necessities. The equality, therefore, that is aimed at is not an equality as to the amount of property, but equal relief from the burden of want, as the whole passage shows. (3) There is a special obligation to relieve fellow-Christians, because they with us are members of Christ's body, and because there is no need to fear that the giving will encourage idleness or vice. (4) The poor have no right to depend upon the benefactions of the rich. See 2 Thess. iii. 10. Thus the Scriptures avoid the injustice of agrarian communism, and also the heartless disregard of the poor. Were these principles carried out, there would be among Christians neither idleness nor want (Hodge).

(B⁶) “*God which putteth the same earnest care.*” Ver. 16.

The Apostle attributes the zeal of Titus to God, yet we cannot doubt that this zeal was the spontaneous effusion of his own heart, and an index and element of his character. The instance shows therefore that God can and does control the inward acts and feelings of men without interfering either with their liberty or their responsibility.

(C⁶) *Regard for appearances.* Ver. 21.

There is great practical wisdom and a very useful lesson in this verse. There is no sense in trifling with one's reputation. “We are bound to act in such a way that not only God, who sees the heart and knows all things, may approve our conduct, but also so that men may be constrained to recognize our integrity.” Hence the Apostle prevented all misrepresentation by having another brother to join in the distribution of the money and audit the accounts.

CHAPTER IX.

Ver. 2. ἐξ ὑμῶν] B C S, min. Ambrosiast. Pelag. and several vss. have only ὑμῶν. So also Lachm. and Rück. But ἐξ was not understood and was found superfluous. Why should it be added? — Ver. 4. After ταύτη Elz. has τῆς καυχήσεως, in opposition to B C D* F G S* min. and several vss. and Fathers. An addition by way of gloss from xi. 17. — Ver. 5. The readings πρὸς ὑμᾶς and προεπηγγελμένην (Lachm. Rück. ; Tisch. has adopted only the latter) have preponderant, and the latter through the accession of C S decisive, attestation ; προεπηγγ. is also to be preferred on this account, that προκατηγγ. might very easily arise through alliteration after the previous προκαταρτισ. Reiche has unsatisfactorily defended the *Recepta* εἰς (which crept in easily from viii. 6) and προκατηγγ. — Ver. 7. προαιρεῖται] Lachm. Rück. read προήρηται, following B C F G S 31, Chrys. ms. Cypr. Aug. Pel. and several vss. But the sense : *prout destinavit*, presented itself to the not further reflecting copyists as so natural, that with the similarity of the two forms the present might drop out far more easily than come in. — Ver. 8. δυνατός] Lach. and Rück. read δυνατεῖ. It has, indeed, the attestation of B C* D* F G (?) S ; but if δυνατεῖ were the original reading, the gloss would not have been δυνατός simply, but δυνατός ἐστι, as in Rom. xiv. 4. or δύναται. — Ver. 10. σπέρμα] B D* F G 80, have σπόρον. So Lachm. and Rück. Occasioned by the thought of the σπόρον following. — χορηγήσει . . . πληθυνεῖ . . . ἀνξήσει] Elz. has χορηγήσαι . . . πληθύναι . . . ἀνξήσαι, in opposition to B C E* F G S, min. Syr. Arr. Copt. Aeth. Arm. Vulg. It. Cyr. Cypr. Ambrosiast. Aug. The future was wrongly taken in the sense of *wish*, and accordingly, aided perhaps by the recollection of such passages as 1 Thess. iii. 11, 12 ; 2 Thess. ii. 17, iii. 5, was changed into the optative.¹ So also in Rom. xvi. 20, instead of συντρίψει, συντρίψαι crept into A, vss. and Fathers. — Ver. 15. δέ after χάρις is, with Lachm. and Tisch., to be deleted on preponderating evidence.

CONTENTS.—By a delicate turn in vv. 1 and 2 Paul begins once more from the work of collection, and impresses on his readers : (1) that they should make ready the bounty *soon*, before his arrival, vv. 3–5 : further, (2) that they should give *amply*, vv. 5 and 6 ; and (3) that they should give *with all willingness*, ver. 7 ; whereupon (4) he points them to *the blessing* of God, vv. 8–11, and, finally, brings into prominence the religious consequence of the *thanksgivings towards God*, which their beneficence will call forth, vv. 12–14. An utterance of thanks to God forms the conclusion, ver. 15.

Ver. 1. Since the γάρ connects the verse with what precedes, not only does the opinion of Selmer, that chap. ix. contains a separate Epistle, fall to the

¹ For that these forms are not *infinitives*, is abundantly shown in Fritzsche, *Diss.* II. p. 82 ff.

ground, but also the hypothesis, that Paul writes *as if* he were beginning a new topic,—on the basis of which, *e.g.* Emmerling (comp. Neander) thinks that between the composition of chap. viii. and that of chap. ix. a considerable time had elapsed. Against this may be urged also the fact that in new sections he does not begin with *περὶ μέν*, but with *περὶ δέ* (1 Cor. vii. 1, viii. 1, xii. 1, xvi. 1). Estius is right in saying that the apostle specifies with *γάρ* the reason why he, in what goes before (viii. 24), had exhorted them not to collecting, but to affectionate receiving of the brethren. Comp. Fritzsche, *Dissert.* II. p. 21: “*Laute excipite fratres, id moneo* (viii. 24) ; *nam praeter rem ad liberalitatem denuo quidem provocarem ad eam jam propensos homines,*” ver. 2. So also Schott, *Isag.* p. 240 ; Billroth, Rückert, Olshausen, Osiander ; but there is no indication of a contrast with the *Gentile-Christian* churches (as if the *ἅγιοι* were the *ἐκκλησία κατ’ ἐξοχήν*), although Hofmann imports it. — *μέν*] To this the *δέ* in ver. 3 corresponds. See on that passage. The counter-remark of de Wette (who, with Osiander and Neander, takes the *μέν* as *solitarium*), that *δέ* in ver. 3 makes a contrast with ver. 2, does not hold good, since the contrast is quite as suitable to ver. 1 (though having respect to what is said in ver. 2). Even in classic writers (often in Thucyd.) the clauses corresponding to each other with *μέν* and *δέ* are found separated by intervening clauses. See Kühner, II. p. 428. — *τῆς διακονίας τῆς εἰς τ. ἁγ.*] as in viii. 4. Beza is incorrect (see ver. 2) in saying that the *bringing over* only is meant. The word itself corresponds to the idea of Christian fellowship in love, in which the mutual activity of love is a constant *debitum ministerium* (Rom. xiii. 8 ; Heb. vi. 10 ; 1 Pet. iv. 10), after the example of Christ (Matt. xx. 28 ; Luke xxii. 26 f.). Comp. Gal. v. 13. — *περισσὸν μοί ἐστι*] *i.e.* *I do not need writing*, namely, to effect my object. — *τὸ γράφειν*] with article, because the writing is regarded as actual subject.

REMARK.—Certainly Paul *has* written of the collection both in chap. viii. and again in what follows ; and he *meant* it so, otherwise he would have ended the section with chap. viii. But he delicately makes a rhetorical turn, so that, in order to spare the readers’ sense of honour, he seems not to take up the *subject* again, but to speak only of the *sending of the brethren* ; and he annexes to that what he intends still to insert regarding the *matter itself*. *Σοφῶς δὲ τοῦτο ποιεῖ, ὥστε μᾶλλον αὐτοὺς ἐπισπάσασθαι.* Theophylact and Chrysostom. Probably, when he wrote viii. 24, he meant to close the section with it, but—perhaps after reading over chap. viii. again—was induced to add something, which he did in this polite fashion (*τῇ τοιαύτῃ τῶν λόγων μεθόδῳ*, Theodoret). Hofmann’s idea—that *recommendation of the collection itself* was superfluous, but that there had been delay in *carrying it out*, etc.—is quite in accordance certainly with vv. 1–5, but from ver. 5 to the end of the chapter there again follow instructions and promises, which belong essentially to the recommendation of the collection itself.

Ver. 2. *Τὴν προθυμ. ὑμῶν*] Rückert infers from the whole contents of the two chapters that the inclination is only *assumed* as still existing, and no longer existed in *reality* ; but his inference is unjust, and at variance with

the apostle's character. Already, ἀπὸ πέρυσι (viii. 10) have the readers begun to collect, and the work of love, in fact, needed only the carrying out, which Paul intends by chap. viii. and ix. to procure. — ἦν ὑπὲρ ὑμ. καθ. Μακεδ.] *of which I make my boast in your favour* (in your recommendation) *to the Macedonians*; for the Corinthians were made *by Paul* to favour the collection. On καθάομαι, with the accusative of the object, comp. vii. 14, x. 8, xi. 30; LXX. Prov. xxvii. 1; Lucian, *Ocyp.* 120; Athen. xiv. p. 627 C. On the *present* Bengel rightly remarks: “Adhuc erat P. in Macedonia.” — ὅτι Ἀχαΐα παρεσκ. ἀπὸ πέρυσι] so ran the καθῶμαι: *that Achaia has been in readiness* (to give pecuniary aid to promote it) since the previous year. Paul says Ἀχαΐα, not ὑμεῖς (comp. ver. 3), because he repeats words actually used by him. These concerned not *only* Corinth, but the whole *province*, in which, however, the Corinthian was the central church. Comp. on i. 1. — καὶ ὁ ἐξ ὑμῶν ζῆλος¹ κ.τ.λ.] is, by way of attraction, an expression of the thought: *your zeal wrought forth from you as stimulating to them*. Comp. from the N. T. Matt. xxiv. 17; Luke xi. 13. See on Matt. *l.c.* and Hermann, *ad Viger.* p. 893; Kühner, *ad Xen. Anab.* i. 1. 5. — τοὺς πλείονας] *the majority* of the Macedonians, so that only the minority remained uninfluenced.

REMARK.—Paul might with perfect truth stimulate (1) the Macedonians by the zeal of the Corinthians, because the latter had begun the work *earlier than the former*, and were already ἀπὸ πέρυσι in readiness; and then (2) the Corinthians, again, by the example of the Macedonians (viii. 1 ff.), since the latter, after having followed the Corinthians in the prosecution of the work, had shown such extraordinary activity as in turn to serve the Corinthians a model and a stimulus to *further* beneficence. Is it not possible that in the very same affair first A should be held up as a model to B, and then, according to the measure of the success, conversely B to A? Hence Theodoret and many (comp. also Chrysostom) have rightly remarked on the *wisdom* in the apostle's conduct; whereas Rückert declares this conduct of his to be *unwise* (of its morality he prefers to be silent), unjustly taking it for granted that his καθᾶσθαι regarding the Corinthians was *untrue*. See vii. 14. De Wette also thinks that the apostle is not free from human error here. (D⁶) — That in ἀνθαιρετοι, at viii. 3, there is no contradiction with ix. 2, see on viii. 3.

Ver. 3. *Connection*: Although in regard to the *collection* I do not need to *write* to you, and that for the reason stated in ver. 2, I have yet not been able to omit the *sending of the brethren* for this purpose, in order that, etc. Paul by this would direct attention not to the *general* object of this mission, but to the *special* one of having all things ready *before his arrival*. See what follows. On μὲν . . . δέ, which may often be translated *etsi . . . tamen*, comp. Xen. *Anab.* ii. 3. 10, and Kühner *in loc.* The same is more strongly

¹ The form τὸ ζῆλος is found here in B N (Lachm. ed. min.); it has much stronger attestation in Phil. iii. 6. Running counter to the usage of the whole N. T., it must be considered as an error of the copyists,

though it really occurs in Clem. *Cor.* i. 4 (thrice) and 6, and Ignatius, *Trall.* 4 (Dressel), and hence was doubtless known to the copyists.

expressed by *μὲν . . . ὁμῶς δέ*, Ellendt, *Lex. Soph.* II. p. 76, or *μὲν . . . μέντοι*, Viger. p. 536. — *τοὺς ἀδελφούς*] Titus and the two others, viii. 17 ff. — *τὸ καύχημα ἡμῶν τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμ.*] on account of the following *ἐν τῷ μέρει τούτῳ*, which first *adds* the special reference to the general, is not to be understood of the special *καυχᾶσθαι* described in ver. 2, but is to be taken *generally*: in order that that, of which we boast on your behalf (*καύχημα* is here *materies gloriandi*, and not equivalent to *καύχησις*), might not become empty (1 Cor. ix. 15), i.e. might not be found without reality in this point, in the matter of the collection,—if, namely, on our arrival it should be found that your benevolent activity had come to a standstill or become retrograde. See ver. 4. In the addition *ἐν τῷ μέρει τούτῳ* (comp. iii. 10) there lies an “*acris cum tacita laude exhortatio*” (Estius); for Paul has not a similar anxiety in respect to other sides of the *καύχημα* (comp. vii. 4). Billroth considers *ἐν τ. μέρει τ.* as pointing to ver. 4, and takes *τὸ καύχημα κ.τ.λ.* of the special boast in ver. 2: “in this respect, namely, inasmuch as, if Macedonians come with me . . . we . . . are put to shame.” Involved, because *ἵνα καθὼς . . . ἦτε* lies between; and at variance with the parallel *ἐν τῇ ὑποστάσει ταύτῃ* of ver. 4. — *ἵνα καθὼς κ.τ.λ.*] forms, with the following *μήπως κ.τ.λ.*, a positive parallel to the previous negative *ἵνα μὴ τὸ καύχημα . . . τούτῳ*. Comp. on *ἵνα* repeated in parallel clauses, Rom. vii. 13; Gal. iii. 14, iv. 5.

Ver. 4. *Lest perhaps*, etc.; this is to be guarded against by the *παρεσκευασμένοι ἦτε*. — *εἰὰν ἐλθῶσι κ.τ.λ.*] if there shall have come, etc., namely, as giving escort after the fashion of the ancient church. See Acts xvii. 14, 15, *al.*; 2 Cor. i. 16; 1 Cor. xvi. 6; Rom. xv. 24. — *Μακεδόνες*] Macedonians without the article. — *ἀπαρασκευάστους*] not in readiness (often in Xen., as *Anab.* i. 5. 9); *ἀπάρασκευος* is more frequent, and the two words are often interchanged in the mss.; see Bornemann, *ad Xen. Anab.* i. 1. 6. Here it is equivalent to: so that you are not ready to hand over the money; the expression is *purposely chosen* in reference to ver. 2. — *ἐμεῖς*] see ver. 3. But because this being put to shame in the case supposed would have involved the Corinthians as its originators, Paul with tender delicacy (not serene pleasantry, as Olshausen thinks), moving the sense of honour of the readers, adds parenthetically: *ἵνα μὴ λέγωμεν ὑμεῖς*. — *ἐν τῇ ὑποστάσει ταύτῃ*] in respect of this confidence, according to which we have maintained that you were in readiness. Comp. xi. 17; Heb. iii. 14, xi. 1; LXX. Ps. xxxix. 7; Ezek. xix. 5; Ruth i. 12; and passages in Wetstein; Suicer, *Thes.* II. p. 1398. So Calvin, Beza, Erasmus Schmid, Calovius, Wolf, Bengel, Rosenmüller, and others, including de Wette, Osiander, Hofmann. But others take it as quite equivalent to *ἐν τῷ μέρει τούτῳ*, ver. 3: *in hac materia, in hoc argumento* (gloriationis). Comp. Vulgate: *in hac substantia*. So Chrysostom, Theophylact, Erasmus, Castalio, Estius, Kypke, Munthe, and others, including Schrader, Rückert, Olshausen, Ewald. Linguistically correct, no doubt (Polyb. iv. 2. 1; Casaubon, *ad Polyb.* i. 5. 3, p. 111; Diodorus, i. 3; comp. also Heb. i. 3, and Bleek, *Heb. Br.* II. 1, p. 61 f.), but here a point quite unnecessary to be mentioned. And why should we depart from the meaning: *confidence*, when this is certain in the usage of the N. T., and here, as at xi. 17, is strikingly appropriate? The insertion of *ἵνα μὴ λ. ὑμεῖς* forms

no objection (this in opposition to Rückert), since certainly the putting to shame of the apostle in regard to his confidence would have been laid to the blame of the Corinthians, because they would have frustrated this confidence ; hence there is not even ground for referring that insertion *merely* to καταισχ. exclusive of ἐν τ. ὑποστ. τ. (Hofmann). Lastly, the explanation of Grotius : *in hoc fundamento meae jactationis*, has likewise, doubtless, some support in linguistic usage (Diodor. i. 66, xiii. 82, *al.* ; LXX. Ps. lxix. 2 ; Jer. xxiii. 22, *al.*), but falls to the ground, because τῆς κανχ. is not genuine.

Ver. 5. οὖν] in pursuance of what was said in ver. 4. — ἵνα] comp. viii. 6. — προέλθ.] namely, before my arrival and that of the Macedonians possibly accompanying me. The *thrice-repeated* προ- is not used by accident, but adds point to the instigation to have everything ready before the apostle's arrival. — προκαταρτίσ.] *adjusted beforehand, put into complete order beforehand*, Hippocr. p. 24, 10; 18. — τὴν προεπηγγελμένην εὐλογίαν ὑμῶν] *your blessing promised beforehand* (by me). See vv. 2–4. On προεπ., comp. Rom. i. 2. Erasmus, Estius, Rückert, and some others at variance with the context, take it : the blessing formerly promised *by you*. — εὐλογία is a characteristically conciliatory (καὶ τῇ προσηγορίᾳ αὐτοῦς ἐπεσπάσατο, Chrysostom) designation of the *collection*, inasmuch as it is for the receivers a practical *blessing* proceeding from the givers (*i.e.* πληθυσμὸς ἀγαθῶν ἐξ ἐκουσιότητος, διδόμενος, Phavor.). Comp. on εὐλογία in the sense of good deed, LXX. Gen. xxxiii. 11 ; Judg. i. 15 ; Ezek. xxxiv. 26 ; Ecclus. xxxix. 22 ; Wisd. xv. 19 ; Eph. i. 3. — ταύτην ἐτοίμην εἶναι οὕτως ὡς κ.τ.λ.] the intended consequence of προκαταρτ. τ. προεπ. εὐλ. ὑμῶν, so that the infinitive in the sense of ὥστε (Kühner, II. p. 565, *ad Xen. Mem.* ii. 5. 3) and ταύτην, which attaches itself more emphatically to what has to come than to what goes before (Hofmann), are used *anaphorically* (Bernhardy, p. 283) : *that this may be in readiness thus like blessing and not like covetousness*, in such manner that it may have the quality of blessing, not of covetousness ; in other words, that it may be *liberal*, which is the character of εὐλογία, and not *sparing*, as covetousness shows itself in giving. Πλεονεξία does not mean here or anywhere else *parsimony* (Flatt, Rückert, de Wette, and many others) ; but Paul conceives of the sparing giver as *covetous*, in so far as such a man desires *himself to have* that which he contributes, *in order to increase his own*, and therefore gives but very *scantily*. Following Chrysostom (comp. Erasmus, *Paraphr.* and Beza), Billroth refers πλεονεξία to *Paul and his colleagues* : “Your gift is to be a free, and not an extorted, one.” Against this may be urged as well the analogy of ὡς εὐλογίαν, as also ver. 6, where the meaning of ὡς πλεονεξ. is represented by φειδομένως ; hence also we must not, with Rückert and others, *combine* the ideas of *willingly* and *unwillingly* (which are not mentioned till ver. 7) with those of giving *liberally* and *sparingly*. — (E⁶). On οὕτως after its adjective, see Stallb. *ad Plat. Rep.* p. 500 A.

Ver. 6. Allusion to the Messianic recompense. Chrysostom aptly remarks : καὶ σπόρον τὸ πρᾶγμα ἐκάλεσεν, ἵνα εὐθέως πρὸς τὴν ἀντίδοσιν ἴδῃς καὶ τὸν ἀμητὸν ἐννοήσας μάθῃς ὅτι πλείονα λαμβάνεις ἢ δίδως. The δέ is *continuative*, not *restrictive*, as Billroth thinks (“but so much know”), since the subsequent

ἐπ' εὐλογίαις proves that in ver. 6 exactly the *same* two kinds of giving are expressed as in ver. 5. — τοῦτο δέ] after Chrysostom and the Vulgate, is explained by the expositors supplying a λέγω or ἰστέον. But with what warrant from the context? Beza already made the admission: "quamvis haec ellipsis Graeco sermoni sit inusitata." Comp. Gal. iii. 17; 1 Thess. iv. 17; 1 Cor. vii. 29, *al.*, where Paul *adds* the verb of saying. Even the comparison of Phil. iii. 14, where, in fact, to the ἐν δέ its verb is brought from the context, does not settle the question of the asyndetic τοῦτο (in opposition to Hofmann). Τοῦτο might be regarded as the object of σπείρων; but in that case there would result for τοῦτο an inappropriate emphasis (*this* kind of seed), seeing that a σπεῖρειν was not mentioned before, and the figure here comes in as new. Hence τοῦτο may be regarded as *accusative absolute* (see on vi. 13), taking up again with special weight what was just said, in order to attach to it something further: *Now as concerns this*, namely, this ὡς εὐλογίαν, κ. μὴ ὡς πλεονεξίαν, *it is the case that*, etc. Lachmann placed ὁ σπείρων . . . ἐπ' εὐλογ. κ. θερίσει in a parenthesis. This would require us to supply *faciat* after ἕκαστος, or even the more definite *det* (from δότην in ver. 7). But it would be unsuitable to assign to the important thought of ver. 6 merely the place of a parenthetical idea. — φειδομένως] *in a sparing way* (Plut. *Al.* 25), so that he scatters only parsimoniously, narrowly, and scantily. But in φειδομένως κ. θερίσει the one who spares and holds back is the giver of the harvest, *i.e.* apart from figure: *Christ the bestower of the Messianic salvation*, who gives to the man in question only the corresponding lesser degree of blessedness. Comp. v. 10; Rom. xiv. 10; Gal. vi. 7. — ἐπ' εὐλογίαις] denotes the relation occurring in the case (Matthiae, p. 1370 f.; Fritzsche, *ad Rom.* I. p. 315): *with blessings*, which, namely, he, when sowing, *imparts*, and in turn *receives* when reaping, *i.e.* according to the context, *richly*. Comp. ver. 5. In the reaping *Christ* is likewise the distributor of blessings, bestowing on him, who has sowed in a blessed way, the appropriate great reward in Messianic blessedness. On the whole figure, comp. Prov. xi. 24, xxii. 8; Ps. cxii. 9; Gal. vi. 8, 9. The *plural* strengthens the idea of richness, denoting its manifold kinds and shapes, etc. Maetzner, *ad Lycurg.* p. 144 f.). The juxtaposition also serves as strengthening: ἐπ' εὐλογ., ἐπ' εὐλογ. Comp. on 1 Cor. vi. 4. The fact that the *measure* of well-doing is *conditioned* by *one's own means*, is guarded already at viii. 12. Comp. in general, Matt. xxv. 20 ff. See Calovius on this passage, in opposition to the misuse of it by Roman Catholics as regards the *merit* of good works—the moral measure of which, however, will, according to the divine saving decree, have as its consequence merely different *degrees* of the blessedness won for believers through Christ. The very nature of good works, which subjectively are the fruits of faith and objectively the fruits of the divine preparation of grace (Eph. ii. 10), excludes the idea of merit.¹

Ver. 7. But Paul does not desire them to give richly *against their will*; hence the *new exhortation*: *Let every one give freely and willingly!* — ἕκαστος καθὼς κ.τ.λ.] *as each one purposes it to himself in his heart*, namely, *let him give*,

¹ Comp. Weiss, *Ull. Theol.* p. 378 f.

—a supplement, which readily flows from the previous ὁ σπείρων ; comp. the subsequent δότην. Let him give *according to cordial, free, self-determination*. On τῇ καρδ., comp. τῇ ψυχῇ, Gen. xxxiv. 8. The *present* is used, because the προαιρεῖσθαι is conceived as only now emerging after the foregoing teaching.¹ In προαιρέομαι (only here in the N. T., but often in the sense of resolving in Greek writers ; comp. 2 Macc. vi. 9 ; 3 Macc. ii. 30, vi. 10 ; 4 Macc. ix. 1), προ has the notion of the *preference*, which we give to that on which we resolve, because the simple αἰρεῖσθαι has the sense of *sibi eligere*, where it likewise expresses a resolve or purpose (Xen. vii. 6. 37 ; Ages. iii. 4 ; Soph. Ajax, 443 ; Isocrates, Panath. 185). Hence μάλλον also, though in itself superfluous, may be added to προαιρεῖσθαι (Xen. Mem. ii. 1. 2, iii. 5. 16, iv. 2. 9). — ἐκ λύπης ἢ ἐξ ἀνάγκης] The opposite of καθὼς προαιρ. τ. καρδ. : *out of sadness*, namely, at having to lose something by the giving, *or out of necessity*, because one thinks himself forced by circumstances and cannot do otherwise (comp. Philem. 14). Ἐκ denotes the subjective state, out of which the action proceeds. To the ἐκ λύπης stands contrasted ἐξ εὐμενῶν στέρνων, Soph. Oed. C. 488 ; and to the ἐξ ἀνάγκης, the ἐκ θυμοῦ φιλέων, Hom. Il. ix. 486. — ἰλαρόν γὰρ κ.τ.λ.] Motive for complying with this precept. The emphasis is on ἰλαρόν, whereby the opposite, as the giving ἐκ λύπης and ἐξ ἀνάγκης, is excluded from the love of God. Comp. Rom. xii. 8. The saying is from LXX. Prov. xxii. 8, according to the reading : ἀγαπᾷ instead of εὐλογεῖ. It is wanting in our present Hebrew text. Comp. also Ecclus. xiv. 16, and the Rabbinical passages in Wetstein ; Senec. de benef. ii. 1. 2 : “in beneficio jucundissimo est tribuentis voluntas.” Instead of δότης, δοτήρ or δωτήρ only is found in classical authors ; in Hes. Op. 353, δώτης also. See in general, Lobeck, Paralip. p. 428.

Ver. 8 ff. After Paul has aroused them to ample and willing giving, he adds further the assurance, that God *can* bestow (vv. 8, 9), and *will* bestow (vv. 10, 11) on them the means also for such beneficence. Finally, he subjoins the *religious* gain, which this work of contributing brings, ver. 11, ἥτις κατεργάζεται κ.τ.λ., on to ver. 14.

Ver. 8. The δέ is continuative ; δυνατός, however, is with emphasis prefixed, for the course of thought is : God *has the power*, and (ver. 10) He *will* also do it. The discourse sets out from *possibility*, and passes over to *reality*. — πᾶσαν χάριν] *every showing of kindness*. This refers to *earthly blessing*, by which we have the *means* for beneficence ; see the sentence of aim, that follows. Chrysostom correctly says : ἐμπλῆσαι ὑμᾶς τοσούτων ὥς δύνασθαι περιττεῖν ἐν τῇ φιλοτιμίᾳ ταύτῃ. Theodoret and Wolf, at variance with the context, hold that it applies to *spiritual* blessings ; Flatt and Osiander blessings of *both kinds*. — περισσεῦσαι] transitive : *efficere ut largissime redundet in vos*. See on iv. 15. — ἐν παντὶ πάντοτε πᾶσαν] *in all points at all times all*, an energetic accumulation. Comp. on Eph. v. 20 ; Phil. i. 3, 4. — πᾶσαν ἀντάρκειαν ἔχοντες] *having every*, that is, *all possible self-sufficing* ; for this is the *subjective condition*, without which we cannot, with all blessing of God, have abundance εἰς πᾶν ἔργον

¹ The θέλειν, not yet taking definite shape, already existed ἀπὸ πέρυσι ; but the definite determination *how much* each desires to

give, is conceived by Paul as occurring now, after the readers have read ver. 6.

ἀγαθόν. Hence Paul brings out so emphatically this necessary *subjective* requirement for attaining the purpose, which God connects with his *objective* blessing : *in order that you, as being in every case always quite self-contented*, etc. Αὐτάρκεια is not the *sufficienter habere* in the sense of *external* position, in which no help from others is needed (as it is taken usually ; also by Emmerling, Flatt, Rückert, Osiander), but rather (comp. Hofmann also) the *subjective* frame of mind, in which we feel ourselves so contented with what we ourselves have that we desire nothing from others,—the *inward self-sufficing*, to which stands opposed the προσδεῖς ἄλλων (Plato, *Tim.* p. 33 D) and ἐπιθυμεῖν τῶν ἀλλοτρίων. Comp. 1 Tim. vi. 6 ; Phil. iv. 11, and the passages in Wetstein. It is a moral quality (for which reason Paul could say so earnestly ἐν παντὶ πάντ. πᾶς., without saying too much), may subsist amidst very different external circumstances, and is not dependent on these,—which, indeed, in its very nature, as τελειότης κτήσεως ἀγαθῶν (Plato, *Def.* p. 412 B), it cannot be. Comp. Dem. 450. 14 ; Polyb. vi. 48. 7 : πρὸς πᾶσαν περίστασιν αὐτάρκης. — περισσεύητε εἰς πᾶν ἔργον ἀγαθόν] *that you may have abundance* (comp. ἐν παντὶ πλουτιζόμενοι, ver. 11) *for every good work* (work of beneficence ; comp. Acts ix. 36, and see Knapp, *Opusc.*, ed. 1, p. 486 ff.). If Rückert had not taken αὐτάρκεια in an objective sense at variance with the notion, he would not have refined so much on περισσ., which he understands as referring to the *growth of the Corinthians themselves* : “in order that you, having at all times full sufficiency . . . may become ever more diligent unto every good work.” De Wette also refines on the word, taking the participial clause of that, which, *in spite of the* περισσεῦσαι *takes place in the same* : “*inasmuch as you have withal for yourselves quite enough*,” which would present a very external and selfish consideration to the reader, and that withal expressed of set purpose so strongly !

Ver. 9 connects itself with περισσ. εἰς πᾶν ἔργον ἀγαθ. This περισσεύειν is to exhibit the fulfilment of the Scripture saying in your case : *He scattered, He gave to the poor ;¹ His righteousness remains for ever*. The quotation is Ps. cxii. 9 (exactly after the LXX.), where the subject is ἀνὴρ ὁ φοβούμενος τὸν κύριον. — ἐσκόρπισεν] figurative description of the beneficent man, who μετὰ δαυιλείας ἔδωκε, Chrysostom. Comp. Symmachus, Prov. xi. 24. Bengel well says : “Verbum generosum : *Spargere*, plena manu, sine anxia cogitatione, quorsum singula grana cadant.” But that *Paul* (not the original) had in his view the image of strewing *seed*, is already probable from ver. 6, and is confirmed by ver. 10 (in opposition to Hofmann). Regarding the use in late Greek of the originally Ionic word, see Lobeck, *ad Phryn.* p. 218. — ἡ δικαιοσύνη] is not, with Chrysostom, Theophylact, Calvin, Grotius, Estius, Bengel, Rosenmüller, Vater, Emmerling, and others, to be taken as *beneficence* (Zachariae and Flatt have even : *recompense*), which it never means, not even in Matt. vi. 1 ; but it *always* means *righteousness*,

¹ Regarding the notion of πένης, which does not occur elsewhere in the N. T. (ὁ ἐκ πόνου καὶ ἐνεργείας τὸ ζῆν ἔχων, *Etym. M.*), and its distinction from πτωχός, which among the Greeks expresses the notion of mendi-

cant poverty, see Arist. *Plut.* 552 f. ; Stallb. *ad Plat. Apol.* p. 23 C. Regarding αἶσος. *egenus*, *esuriens*, see Jacobs, *ad Anthol.* IX. p. 431, XII. p. 465.

which, however, may, according to the context, as here (comp. Tob. xiv. 11), be *that which expresses itself by doing good*. So also $\text{תָּרַח$, which on this account is often translated by $\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\eta\mu\omicron\sigma\acute{\iota}\nu\eta$ in the LXX. (see Gesen. *Thes.* III. p. 1151; Buxt. *Lex. Talm.* p. 1890). The Christian moral righteousness is beneficent through the love which comes from faith. Comp. Rom. xii. 9, x. 13–15; Gal. v. 6. — $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\epsilon\iota \epsilon\iota\varsigma \tau. \alpha\iota\omega\nu\alpha$] is, according to Paul, to be taken quite in the full sense of the words: *remains for ever* (comp. Diod. i. 56; Lucian, *Philops.* 17), never ceases, either before the Parousia, when his $\delta\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\omicron\sigma\acute{\iota}\nu\eta$ continues to develop its vital activity, as in general, so specially through beneficent love, or after the Parousia, when, in itself incapable of being lost, it has its eternal subsistence in love that cannot be lost (1 Cor. xiii. 8, 13). Explanations, such as of a *perpetua laus apud homines and gloriosa merces apud Deum* (Estius, comp. Chrysostom, Grotius, Emmerling, and others), or that it applies merely to the *earthly lifetime* of the beneficent one (Beza), are at variance with the words, which affirm the $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\epsilon\iota\nu$ of the $\delta\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\omicron\sigma\acute{\iota}\nu\eta$ itself; and in the N. T. $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\epsilon\iota\nu \epsilon\iota\varsigma \tau\omicron\nu \alpha\iota\omega\nu\alpha$ is always to be taken in the definite sense of *eternal* abiding. See John viii. 34, xii. 34; Heb. vii. 24; 1 Pet. i. 25; 1 John ii. 17. Comp. $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\epsilon\iota\nu \epsilon\iota\varsigma \zeta\omega\eta\nu \alpha\iota\omega\nu\iota\omicron\nu$, John vi. 27. Hence de Wette also takes it too indefinitely: “that the beneficence itself, or the means for it, *has enduring subsistence*.” Chrysostom and Theodoret have, moreover, inverting the matter, found the beneficence here, which Chrysostom compares to a fire consuming sins, to be the *cause* of the justification. It is its *consequence and effect*, Gal. v. 6, 22, Col. iii. 12 ff., *al.*, as is the Christian righteousness of life itself, Rom. vi., viii. 4 ff. (F⁶)

Ver. 10. The progress of the discourse is this: *able* is God, etc., ver. 8; but He who gives seed, etc., *will also do it*. The description of God introduced by $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ contains the *ground* of this promise, which rests on a syllogism *a minori ad majus*. — *Who supplies seed to the sower and bread for eating*, is a reminiscence of Isa. lv. 10, which is very suitable to the figure prominent in the context (vv. 6, 9). On $\beta\rho\omega\varsigma\iota\varsigma$ *actus edendi*, differing from $\beta\rho\omega\mu\alpha$, *cibus*, see on Rom. xiv. 17; 1 Cor. viii. 4; Col. ii. 16. — Chrysostom, Castalio, Beza, and others, including Hofmann, rightly connect $\chi\omicron\rho\eta\gamma\acute{\eta}\sigma\epsilon\iota$ with what follows. Erasmus, Luther, Calvin, Estius, Elzevir, and others, including Ewald and Neander, think that $\kappa\alpha\iota \acute{\alpha}\rho\tau\omicron\nu \epsilon\iota\varsigma \beta\rho\omega\sigma\iota\nu \chi\omicron\rho\eta\gamma$. should go together. This would be at variance with Isa. lv. 10, and would destroy the symmetrical relation of the two parts of the verse. — $\chi\omicron\rho\eta\gamma\acute{\eta}\sigma\epsilon\iota^1 \kappa. \pi\lambda\eta\theta\upsilon\nu\epsilon\iota \tau\omicron\nu \sigma\pi\acute{o}\rho\omicron\nu \dot{\iota}\mu\omega\nu$] *i.e.* dropping the figure: *will give and increase the means, with which you distribute benefits*. What is given away benevolently by the readers, is *the seed which they scatter* ($\acute{o} \sigma\pi\acute{o}\rho\omicron\varsigma \alpha\upsilon\tau\omega\nu$); hence Rückert's idea is arbitrary and unnecessary, that here two clauses, $\chi\omicron\rho\eta\gamma\acute{\eta}\sigma\epsilon\iota \dot{\iota}\mu\iota\nu \sigma\pi\acute{o}\rho\omicron\nu$ and $\pi\lambda\eta\theta\upsilon\nu\epsilon\iota \tau\omicron\nu \sigma\pi\acute{o}\rho\omicron\nu \dot{\iota}\mu\omega\nu$, are blended into one. Rückert also inappropriately thinks that Paul is not speaking at all of the present, but *wholly of the future*, of the blessed consequences of their beneficence now asked, and that $\acute{o} \sigma\pi\acute{o}\rho\omicron\varsigma$, therefore, does not denote what they were now to give away, but *what God*

¹ $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota\chi\omicron\rho\eta\gamma$. and $\chi\omicron\rho\eta\gamma$. are distinguished simply like the German *darreichen* and *reichen, dargeben* and *geben* [give forth and give].

will further bestow on them. At variance with the entire course of the passage (see on ver. 8 ff.) ; and the very δι' ἡμῶν in ver. 11 ought to have prevented the excluding of the present time. Paul intends by χορηγήσει . . . ἡμῶν the means for the *present* work of collection, and only with καὶ αὐξήσει does he promise the blessing thence arising for the future. This κ. αὐξ. τὰ γεννήματα τῆς δικ. ὑμ. corresponds to the preceding καὶ ἄρτον εἰς βρῶσιν : *and will make the fruits of your righteousness grow* (see on ver. 9), *i.e.* and will cause that the blessing, which proceeds from your δικαιοσύνη (*what* blessing that is, see ver. 11) may become always larger. Paul abides by the figure. Just as God causes ἄρτον εἰς βρῶσιν to grow from the natural seed, so from the σπόρος, which the beneficent scatters through his gifts of love. He likewise causes fruits (blessings) to grow ; but because this σπόρος had been sown by the beneficent man *in virtue of his Christian righteousness*, the fruits produced are the γεννήματα τῆς δικαιοσύνης αὐτοῦ, just as the bread-fruits, which the husbandman obtains from his σπόρος, are the γεννήματα of his diligence. Hence Theodoret rightly remarks : σπόρον μέντοι πάλιν τὴν εὐποίησιν ἐκάλεσε. γεννήματα δὲ δικαιοσύνης τὴν ἐκ ταύτης βλαστάσασαν ὠφέλειαν. — γέννημα, in the sense of *vegetable fruit*, according to late Greek ; not to be written γένημα. Comp. on Matt. xxvi. 29. On the figurative expression γεννήμ. τ. δικαιοσ., comp. Hos. x. 12.

Ver. 11. The manner in which they will experience in themselves the αὐξήσει τὰ γεννήματα τ. δικαιοσύνης ὑμῶν just promised. — The *participle* is neither to be supplemented by ἐστέ or ἐσεσθε (Grotius, Rosenmüller, Flatt), nor to be attached to ver. 8, so that vv. 9 and 10 would be a parenthesis (Valla, Cornelius à Lapide, Knatchbull, Homberg, Wolf, Bengel, Schulz), which is forbidden by the portion of the discourse beginning afresh at ver. 10 ; but it is *anacoluthic*, namely, in such a way that it is attached to the mentally supplied logical subject of what is promised in ver. 10 (ὑμεῖς), and indeed of this whole promise, not merely of the portion of it contained in πληθυνεῖ τ. σπόρον ὑμῶν (Hofmann) : *inasmuch as you become enriched*. Comp. on i. 7. The *becoming rich in everything* is, according to the connection (see ver. 10), an *earthly* enrichment, not, however, in and for itself, but with the telic ethical reference : εἰς πᾶσαν ἀπλότητα, whereby Rückert's objection disappears, that it would be unsuitable for the apostle to promise to his readers riches. Rückert understands it of a *spiritual* enrichment (viii. 7), and therefore attaches πλουτιζ. only to τῆς δικαιοσύνης ὑμῶν. This is as arbitrary as Hofmann's interpretation of an *internal* enrichment, *which makes the sowing abundant*, so that they with small means are able to give more liberally than otherwise with large, if *their growth* on all sides *in the Christian life ultimately issues in an increase of entire simplicity and self-devotion*. Without arbitrary restriction and separation, ἐν παντὶ πλουτ. εἰς πᾶσ. ἀπλ. can only be a *modal definition* of the whole promise χορηγήσει on to δικαιοσ. ὑμῶν. — εἰς πᾶσαν ἀπλότ.] ἀπλότης does not mean even here (comp. on viii. 2) *bountifulness*, but *singleness, simplicity of heart* ; and εἰς expresses not the *consequence* of ἐν π. πλουτιζ., but the *aim* : *for every simplicity, i.e. in order to bring it into exercise, to give it satisfaction* (through the corresponding exercise of beneficence). The emphasis rests, as formerly on ἐν παντι, so here on πᾶσαν,

whereby attention is directed to the present work of collection and every one that might be set on foot in future by Paul (*ἥτις κατεργ. δι' ἡμῶν κ.τ.λ.*). — *ἥτις κατεργάζεται κ.τ.λ.*] *quippe quae*, etc. With this the discourse makes the transition to set forth the *religious* side of this blessing of the collecting work, ver. 12 ff. — *δι' ἡμῶν*] *through our means*, in so far as the work of the *ἀπλότης*, the collection, *διακονεῖται ὑφ' ἡμῶν*, viii. 19, 20, and the apostle, for himself and his companions, feels so much *that is elevating* in this service of love, that he cannot let pass unmentioned. — The *thanksgivers* are the *receivers* of the gifts of the *ἀπλότης*. The paraphrase of Grotius : “*quae causa est, cur nos gratias Deo agamus*,” is incorrect (on account of *διὰ*, and of vv. 12, 13). — *τῷ θεῷ*] might belong to *κατεργάζεται*, but is better, because in uniformity with ver. 12, joined to *εὐχαριστίαν* as an appropriating dative (Bernhardy, p. 88), which is quite warranted in view of the construction *εὐχαριστεῖν τινι* (comp. Stallb. *ad Plat. Euthyphr.* p. 13 D, *Apol. S.* p. 30 Δ).

Ver. 12. Confirmation of what was just said *ἥτις κατεργάζεται κ.τ.λ.* by the particular circumstances of the present collection.¹ — *ἡ διακονία τῆς λειτουργ. ταύτης*] *i.e. the service, which you render by this λειτουργία*. And the *work of collection* is called *λειτουργία*, in so far as it was to be regarded, according to its destined consecration to God, as a priestly *bringing of offering* (going to the benefit of the receivers). Comp. on Phil. ii. 17, 25; Rom. xiii. 6, xv. 16. Most others take *ἡ διακονία* of the service of *the apostle*, who took charge of the collection (*τὴν λειτουργίαν ταύτην*). But this is at variance with ver. 13, where *τῆς διακονίας ταύτης* is manifestly equivalent to *τῆς διακονίας τῆς λειτ. ταύτ.*, and must be understood of the service rendered by *the contributors*. Hence the activity of those *conveying* it is not even to be understood as *included* here (Hofmann). — *οὐ μόνον κ.τ.λ.*] The emphasis lies on *προσαναπληρ.* and *περισσ.*, in which case the expression with *ἐστι* denotes how the *διακονία* is as regards its *efficacy*, not simply what it *effects* (this would be the simple present of the verb). The service, etc., has not only the *supplementing* quality, in that it makes up for what the saints lack, but also an *abounding*, exceedingly blissful quality, in that it calls forth many thanksgivings towards God. Others, like Piscator and Flatt, connect *περισσεύουσα τῷ θεῷ* : “it contributes much to glorify God ;” comp. Hofmann : “it makes for God a rich product.” Against linguistic usage, since *περισσεύει μοί τι* means : *I have abundance or superfluity in something* (Thuc. ii. 65. 9 ; Dion. Hal. iii. 11 ; Tob. iv. 16 ; John vi. 13 ; Luke ix. 17 ; comp. Luke xii. 15 ; Mark xii. 44). There must have been used *εἰς θεόν* or *εἰς τὴν δόξαν τοῦ θεοῦ* (Rom. v. 15 ; 2 Cor. iv. 15). — On *προσαναπληρῶ*, *to fill by adding to*, comp. xi. 9 ; Plat. *Men.* p. 84 D ; Diod. v. 71 ; Athen. 14, p. 654 D ; Wisd. xix. 4.

Ver. 13 is not to be placed in a parenthesis ; see on ver. 14. The *participle* is again anacoluthic (comp. on ver. 11). As if he had said before : *by the fact that many give thanks to God*, Paul now continues : *inasmuch as they, induced by the tried character of this service, praise God on account of the sub-*

¹ Nowhere has Paul expressed with so deep fervour and so much fulness as here the blissful influence, which his collecting

among the Greeks for the Jews was to have on the quickening of the religious fellowship between them.

mission, etc.¹ Hofmann considers ver. 13 as co-ordinated with ver. 11, so that the δοξάζοντες τ. θ. would be the subjects themselves performing the service, who by this service prove themselves to be Christians. If so, (1) we should have to leap over ver. 12 as a merely relative appendage of ver. 11, and to eliminate it from the continuity of the chain of thought ; but it does not lend itself to be so dealt with either in virtue of the position assigned to it by ὅτι, or in virtue of the important contents of its two clauses ; (2) we should have to shut our eyes to the fact, that δοξάζοντες τ. θ. is obviously correlative to the previous διὰ πολλ. εὐχαριστιῶν τῷ θεῷ ; finally, we should have to make the participial clause afterwards begin, in a very involved fashion, with ἐπὶ τῇ ὑποταγῇ κ.τ.λ., in spite of the fact that this ἐπὶ could not but at once present itself to, and obtrude itself upon, every reader, as the specification of the ground of the δοξάζοντες τ. θεόν (comp. ver. 15 ; Luke ii. 20 ; Acts iv. 21 ; Eccclus. iii. 2). — The δοκιμὴ τῆς διακον. τ. is the *indoles spectata* (see on viii. 2) of this work of giving, according to which it has shown itself such as might have been expected in keeping with the Christian standard (especially of love). So Theophylact : διὰ τῆς δοκίμου ταύτης καὶ μεμαρτυρημένης ἐπὶ φιλανθρωπία διακονίας. Others take the relation of the genitive as : *the approved quality, in which this bounty has exhibited you*. So Calvin (“erat enim specimen idoneum probandae Corinthiorum caritatis, quod erga fratres procul remotos tam liberales erant”), Estius, Rosenmüller, Flatt, Rückert, Olshausen, de Wette, Ewald, Osiander ; comp. also Hofmann, who takes τῆς διακονίας as *epexegetical* genitive. But it is only in what follows that the ground of the praise is introduced as subsisting *in the Corinthians*, and that by a different preposition (ἐπὶ), and, besides, it is most natural to understand τῆς διακονίας τ. *of that which is attested*, so that the attested character of the collecting work appears as the occasion (διά, see Winer, p. 357 [E. T. 476] ; Bernhardt, p. 235) of God's being praised on account of the obedience of the Corinthians, etc. Observe, withal, how the actual *occasion* which primarily brings about the δοξάζειν τ. θ. (διά), and the deeper *ground* of this δοξάζειν (ἐπὶ), are distinguished. We may add that Rückert arbitrarily finds here an evidence that Paul in the collection had it as his aim to break down the repugnance of the Jewish-Christians towards the Gentile-Christians by this proof of the latter's love. Comp. on 1 Cor. xvi. 1. The work of collection may have *furthered* this reconciliation, but this was not its *aim*. — ἐπὶ τῇ ὑποταγῇ . . . πάντας] contains two reasons for their praising God. The *first* refers to the gospel of Christ (concerning Christ, ii. 12) ; *on account of the compliance with your confession* (because you are so obedient in fact to your Christian confession of faith), they praise God *in reference to the gospel of Christ*, which, in fact, produces such compliance of its confessors. The *second* reason refers to the persons, namely, to them, the receivers them-

¹ Luther and Beza connect διὰ τῆς δοκιμῆς τῆς διακονίας ταύτης with ver. 12, for which Beza adduces the reason that otherwise δοξάζοντες is connected with διά and ἐπὶ without copula,—a reason quite untenable, considering the diversity of the relations expressed by the two prepositions ! And

how very much the symmetry of the passage would be disturbed ! As ver. 11 closed with εὐχαρ. τῷ θεῷ, so also the confirmatory clause closes with ὑχαρ. τῷ θεῷ, and the more precise explanation begins with the following διὰ τῆς δοκ. κ.τ.λ.

selves, and all Christians in general : *and on account of the simplicity of the fellowship* (because you held the Christian fellowship in such a sincere and pure manner) they praise God *in reference to themselves and to all*, as those whom this ἀπλότης τ. κοινωνίας goes to benefit. Paul rightly adds κ. εἰς πάντας; for by the beneficence towards the Jews the Corinthians showed, in point of fact, that they excluded *no* Christians from the sincere fellowship of love. The expositors connect εἰς το εὐαγγ. τ. X. either with τῆς ὁμολογ. ὑμῶν, so that ὁμολογ. εἰς is said, like πίστις εἰς (Erasmus Schmid, Wolf, Flatt, Rückert, Ewald, Osiander, and others, including Billroth), or with τῇ ὑποταγῇ (Chrysostom, Erasmus, Calvin, Beza, Grotius, and many others), and then εἰς αὐτοὺς κ. εἰς πάντας with τῆς κοινωνίας.¹ But this view would require the connecting link of the article both before εἰς τὸ εὐαγγ. and also before εἰς αὐτούς, since neither ὑποτάσσεσθαι nor ὁμολογεῖν nor κοινωνεῖν is construed with εἰς, the last not even in Phil. i. 5 (in opposition to de Wette). The suggestion to which Hofmann has recourse, that the twice used εἰς expresses the *direction* in which both—the ὑποταγὴ τῆς ὁμολογίας and the ἀπλότης τῆς κοινωνίας—take place, has against it the non-insertion of the connecting article, which only may be rightly omitted when εἰς in both cases belongs to the verb (δοξάζοντες τ. θ.).² Rückert's appeal to the inexactness of the language in this chapter is unfounded and the more to be rejected, that no fault can be found with the meaning—by no means tame (Osiander), but rich in significant reference—which arises from the strictly grammatical construction. Observe especially the quite Pauline way of exhausting, by different prepositions, the different characteristic aspects of the subject-matter (here the δοξάζειν τὸν θεόν), which he does according to the categories of the occasion (διὰ), the ground (ἐπὶ), and the point of reference (εἰς : with a view to). Comp. i. 11, Rom. iii. 25, and many other passages. — On ὁμολογία,³ *confession*, comp. 1 Tim. vi. 12, 13 ; Heb. iii. 1, iv. 14, x. 23 ; 3 Esr. ix. 8 ; not so in the Greek writers. The explanation *consensus* (Erasmus : “quod intelligant vos tanto consensu obedire monitis evangelicis,” comp. Castalio, Vatablus, and Calvin) accords, no doubt, with the classical usage, but is at once set aside by the fact that the passage must have run : ἐπὶ τῇ ὁμολογίᾳ τῆς ὑποταγῆς.

Ver. 14. Καὶ αὐτῶν δεήσει ὑπὲρ ὑμ.] does not go with περισσεύουσα in ver. 12, so that ver. 13 would be a parenthesis (Beza, Estius, Rosenmüller, Flatt, Olshausen, de Wette), because in that case Paul would have written very enigmatically, and must at least have continued with διὰ instead of with

¹ Rückert and most others interpret : “on account of the sincerity of your fellowship with them and with all ;” but Billroth and Neander : “on account of the liberality of communication to them and to all,”—which, however, is quite wrong, for ἀπλότης does not mean liberality, and of the communication (which, besides, is never the meaning of κοινωνία at least in the N. T. ; see on Rom. xv. 26, xii. 13, Gal. vi. 6) it could not be said that it had taken place *to all*.

² This, indeed, is quite impossible according to Hofmann's mistaken construing of ἐπὶ τῇ ὑποταγῇ κ.τ.λ. as dependent on the participial clause καὶ αὐτῶν . . . ἐπιποθούντων.

³ Many elder commentators quite arbitrarily took τῆς ὁμολογίας for τῇ ὁμολογουμένῃ. So Beza : “de vestra testata subjectione in evang.” But Erasmus Schmid and Wolf : “ob subjectionem vestram, contestatam in evang.” (so that εἰς τὸ εὐαγγ. is held to belong to τῆς ὁμολογ.).

the dative. Nor yet does it go with *δοξάζοντες*, in which case the dative is either made to depend on *ἐπί* (Luther, Castalio, Bengel), or is taken instrumentally (Emmerling, Billroth, Osiander, Neander; Rückert does not decide), for in the former case there would result an idea strange and destitute of all analogy from the N. T. (Bengel wrongly appeals to 2 Tim. i. 3); in the latter, *καί* would be superfluous, and the prefixing of the *αὐτῶν* would remain entirely unregarded. We must rather take *καὶ αὐτῶν . . . ἐπιποθούντων* together as *genitive absolute* (comp. the punctuation in Lachmann and Tischendorf, also Ewald and Hofmann), and *καὶ αὐτοί* means *they too*, by which is meant to be indicated the fact that, and the mode in which, *on their side also* the *ἀπλότης τῆς κοινωνίας*, which the Corinthians have shown, is returned. Thus: *while they too with prayer for you long after you*. The emergence of the genitive absolute without difference of the subject is a phenomenon also frequent in classical authors. See Poppo, *ad Thucyd.* I. p. 119 f.; Richter, *de anacol.* § 16; Matthiae, p. 1306; Bornemann, *ad Act.* xiii. 6. — *δεήσει* is not instrumental, but an accompanying accessory definition of the mode: *with prayer, amid prayer* for you.¹ Comp. Bernhardt, p. 100 f. — Regarding *ἐπιποθεῖν*, see on v. 2. It is the longing of pious, grateful love for personal fellowship with the brethren far distant. It is a sheer fancy that it means *maximo amore complecti* (Beza and many others, even Billroth). — *διὰ τὴν ὑπερβάλλουσαν κ.τ.λ.*] reason of this pious longing: *because the grace of God is abundant towards you*. How far this was shown in the present instance, see ver. 13. Chrysostom well says: *ἐπιποθοῦσι γὰρ τοῦτο οὐ διὰ τὰ χρήματα, ἀλλ' ὥστε θεαταὶ γενέσθαι τῆς δεδομένης ὑμῖν χάριτος*. Even in this *δ. τ. ὑπερβάλλ. χάριν*, Hofmann finds the contrast between the *Israelitic* Christians and the *Gentile* Christians, who before had lived beyond the pale of the church of God, and without God in the world. If Paul had meant this relation, he would have expressed it (comp. Eph. ii. 12). — *ἐφ' ὑμῖν* belongs to *ὑπερβάλλ.* Comp. Kühner, *ad Xen. Anab.* iv. 2. 18. *ἐπί* denotes the object, *to which* the activity has passed over. Buttmann, *neut. Gr.* p. 290 [E. T. 337]. (G⁶)

Ver. 15. At the close we have an exclamation of gratitude springing out of deep piety (comp. Rom. ix. 5, xi. 33 ff.; 1 Cor. xv. 57; Gal. i. 5; 1 Tim. i. 17), without any special purpose (such as to awaken humility, Beza; comp. Chrysostom), but issuing out of the fuller craving of the heart, without being intended (as Hofmann holds) to impress the duty of willingly contributing gifts which are so small in comparison. — The *δωρεά* is consequence and evidence of the *χάρις*, ver. 14. Comp. Rom. v. 15, 17. — *ἐπὶ τῇ ἀνεκδιηγ. αὐτοῦ δωρεᾷ*] *on account of his indescribable gift*. What is meant by this is indicated to the Christian consciousness by *ἀνεκδιηγ.* (comp. Rom. xi. 33; Eph. iii. 18 f.), namely, *the whole* wonderful and inexpressibly blissful *work of redemption*. It is *for this*, and not simply for the grace imparted to the

¹ It is the *Christian intercession* of thankfulness for the benefactors, for whom the praying heart yearns. Hofmann goes beyond the text when he imports into this prayer the definite contents: *that God would*

keep the Achaean Christians till the time, when Jesus shall bring together the scattered children of God with those of the Holy Land and people. Matt. xxiv. 31 treats of the Parousia, and is not at all relevant here.

Gentiles (Hofmann), that Paul gives thanks, because it is the gracious *foundation of such fellowship in love, and of its blissful working*. Others¹ understand it of the previously discussed happy result of the work of collection (Calvin, Estius, Bengel, Billroth, Rückert, Osiander; comp. Ewald, who takes χάρις κ.τ.λ. as the quoted closing words of the prayer of gratitude on the part of the church at Jerusalem itself); but in that case ἀνεκδιήγητος appears to be much too strong an epithet, whereas it is quite suitable to the *highest of all* God's gifts, the δωρεὰ κατ' ἐξοχήν. Comp. Rom. v. 15; Heb. vi. 4. — On ἀνεκδιηγήτω, comp. Arrian, *Anab.* p. 310: τὴν ἀνεκδιήγητον τόλμαν. (H⁶)

NOTES BY AMERICAN EDITOR.

(D⁶) *Paul's earnestness.* Ver. 2.

There does not seem any ground for the view of Stanley and Plumptre that the urgency of Paul's appeal here indicates a latent misgiving whether he had not unconsciously overstated the fact, and had mistaken "the will" that had shown itself for an actual readiness to send off the money whenever it was called for. What he told the Macedonians was simply that the Corinthians were prepared — a preparation consisting in alacrity of mind for the work, readiness of purpose, which had not yet been carried out. Paul's urgency is due simply to the desire to have his boasting made good, as the next two verses show.

(E⁶) "*Not of covetousness.*" Ver. 5.

The Revised Version renders this *ad sensum*, if not literally, "not of extortion." After giving due weight to Dr. Meyer's words, it still seems that this thought is necessarily implied in the contrast with a liberal, cheerful giver. To give scantily and grudgingly because of covetousness is to give because the gift is felt to be extorted.

(F⁶) *The promise to the liberal.* Ver. 9.

An objection may be made to the truth of this promise on the ground that we do not always see liberality attended by riches. Hodge replies that this and similar passages in the Old Testament and the New are not to be taken literally or applied universally. They were intended to teach three truths: 1. The tendency of things. Righteousness tends to produce blessedness, as evil tends to produce misery. 2. The general course of divine providence. God does, as a general rule, prosper the diligent and bless the righteous. Even worldly wisdom holds the maxim that honesty is the best policy. 3. Even in this life righteousness produces a hundred-fold more enjoyment than unrighteousness does. In sickness, in bereavement, in poverty, the good man is far happier than the wicked. It is therefore a general law that he that scattereth increaseth, and he that gives shall have wherewith to give.

¹ To these belongs Grotius also, who in his acute way remarks: "Paulus in gratiarum actionem se illis in Judaea fratribus adjungit, et quasi *Amen* illis accinit." Chrys-

ostom and Theophylact quote both explanations, but incline more to that which we have adopted.

(G⁶) "*The exceeding grace of God in you.*" Ver. 14.

The grace which had rendered them such cheerful and liberal givers. The whole section is notable for the light it throws upon Christian morals. There is no praise of voluntary poverty and no denunciation of property, but an exhortation to the right use of worldly means. It is remarkable, as Stanley says, how Paul's inculcation of beneficence differs from the mechanical view of it entertained by the Pharisees, the Koran, and some of the mediaeval saints. They have dwelt upon the amount bestowed as in itself drawing down the divine blessing. The Apostle, even in his undisguised eagerness to obtain the largest possible contribution, insists with no less eagerness on the spirit in which it is given.

(H⁶) *The unspeakable gift.* Ver. 15.

Most readers will agree with Dr. Meyer in referring this burst of exalting praise to the highest of all God's gifts. Shore thinks that such a reference makes too wide a deviation from the immediate context. Plumptre cannot make up his mind as to what the Apostle intended, and thinks that he did not subject "his utterance of praise to a minute analysis." But surely it is most consistent with the natural force of the words, the analogy of Scripture, and the impetuous fervour of the Apostle, to think that he has in mind the one, great, supreme, all-comprehending gift of God, in the mission of His own Son. And so far from there being any impropriety in the sudden change, one may well say with Principal Brown: "This exquisite and resistless outburst of thanksgiving for that gift which not only transcends all our givings, but originates them all, is as sublime as it is suitable at the close of the whole subject of the collection for the poor saints of Jerusalem."

CHAPTER X.

Ver. 7. Instead of ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ read ἐφ' ἑαυτοῦ ; see the exegetical remarks. — After ἡμεῖς Elz. has Χριστοῦ. An addition condemned by a great preponderance of evidence. — Ver. 8. τε] is wanting in B F G, min. Chrys. Theophyl. Bracketed by Lachm., and deleted by Rück. But how easily might the omission of the particle take place, as it might quite well be dispensed with, while there was no ground whatever for inserting it ! — καί before περισσ. has against it the principal uncials and vss. An addition produced by the sense of climax. — ἡμῖν] is, on preponderating evidence, to be deleted, with Lachm. and Tisch. A supplementary insertion, instead of which μοι is also found. — Vv. 12, 13. The words οὐ συνιοῦσιν ἡμεῖς δέ, which follow after ἑαυτοῦς ἑαυτοῖς in the *Recepta*, and are defended by Lachm. Rück. Tisch. Reiche, are wanting in D* F G 109, codd. of the Itala, Ambrosiast. Auct. gr. de singul. cleric. (in Cyprian) Vigil. taps. Idacius, Sedul. (while in 74** Vulg. Lucif. Pel. Fulg. only οὐ συνιοῦσιν is wanting). Condemned by Mill, Bengel, Semler, Morus, Griesb. Rosenm. Flatt, Fritzsche, Billr., Rinck, *Lucubr. crit.* p. 165 f. ; Ewald. But the very fact that we have only Occidental evidence on the side of the omission makes the latter suspicious, and the difficulty of the words (which, with the reference of αὐτοί to *Paul* so easily suggesting itself after ἀλλά, cannot at all be overcome), while in the event of their omission the passage runs on smoothly, makes their deletion appear an expedient critically violent and resorted to in the interest of *explanation*. Where οὐ συνιοῦσιν only is wanting (see above), ἡμεῖς δέ appears to be an imperfect restoration of the imperfect text. — The following κανχησόμεθα also is wanting in D* Clar. Germ., while F G, Boern. Auct. de singul. cler. read κανχώμενοι. But if the word had not been original, but added by way of gloss, the makers of the gloss after their mechanical fashion would not have used the *future*, but the *present*, in accordance with the previous τολμῶμεν, to which the comparison of ver. 15 also might induce them. Hence it is to be assumed that in the witnesses adduced above κανχησόμεθα has *dropped out*. *By what means* we do not know ; perhaps it is simply due to the similar final letters in ἄμετρα and κανχησόμεθα. The κανχώμενοι, subsequently introduced instead of κανχησόμεθα, is to be considered as a critical restoration, made under the influence of ver. 15. — Ver. 14. οὐ γὰρ ὥς μή] Lachm. reads ὥς γὰρ μή, on the authority of B and two min. only, so that he puts a note of interrogation after ἑαυτοῦς. Too weakly attested.

Ch. x.—xiii. contain the *third* chief section of the Epistle, the apostle's *polemic vindication of his apostolic dignity and efficiency*, and then the *conclusion*.

Ch. x. 1–18. After the introduction of vv. 1, 2, which plunges at once *in mediam rem*, Paul, in the first place, makes good against his opponents the power of his genuinely apostolic working (vv. 1–8), in order to repel the

malicious attack that he was strong only in letters (vv. 9–11). This leads him to set forth in contradistinction the very different modes of self-judgment, which are followed by him and his arrogant opponents (vv. 12–16), after which there is further held up to the latter the Christian standard of self-boasting (vv. 17, 18).

REMARK.—The difference of the subject-matter—with the importance of that which had now to be decided—and the emotion excited in the high and pure self-consciousness of the grievously injured Paul, so sufficiently explain the change of tone which at once sets in, and this tone, calculated for the entire discomfiture of his enemies, is just in the last part of the Epistle—after the church as such (as a whole) had been lovingly won over—so suited to its object, that there is no ground at all for the hypothesis of ch. x.–xiii. 10 having formed a separate Epistle (see *Introductio*. § 2). (1⁶)

Ver. 1. Δέ leads over to a new section, and its position lays the emphasis on αὐτός; comp. on Rom. vii. 25: *ipse autem ego*, I, however, *for my own self*, independently and without bias from the action of others among you. See what follows. With this αὐτὸς ἐγώ, Paul, in the feeling of his elevation above such action, boldly casts into the scales of his readers the weight of his own personality over against his calumniators. The expression has something in it nobly proud and defiant; but the ἐμφασις τῆς ἀποστολικῆς ἀξίας¹ lies not in αὐτός, but in ἐγὼ Παῦλος simply. While *many*, as Beza and Olshausen, have left the reference of αὐτός quite unnoticed, and *others* have arbitrarily imported what the context does not suggest, such as Erasmus, Bengel, and also Hofmann;² Emmerling and Rückert assume that Paul wrote from x. 1 onward *with his own hand*, so that the αὐτός was explained to the readers by the altered handwriting. Comp. Ewald, according to whom Paul meant only to add a short word of conclusion with his own hand and therewith to end the letter, but on beginning this concluding word, felt himself urged to enter on a detailed discussion of the matter itself in its personal relations. But, seeing that Paul has not added anything like τῇ ἐμῇ χειρὶ (1 Cor. xvi. 21; Col. iv. 18), or at least written γράφω ὑμῖν instead of παρακαλῶ ὑμᾶς, there is no sufficiently certain hint of this explanation in the words themselves, the more especially as the αὐτὸς ἐγώ is frequently used by him elsewhere (xii. 13; Rom. vii. 25, ix. 3, xv. 14). Rückert finds a confirmation of that hypothesis in the fact that this Epistle

¹ Theodoret, comp. Chrysostom, Theophylact, Oecumenius, and others, including Billroth.

² Erasmus: "ille ipse vobis abunde spectatus P., qui vestrae salutis causa tantum malorum et passus sum et patior." Bengel, however, hesitates between *three* references: "*ipse* facit antitheton vel ad Titum et fratres duos, quos praemisit P., vel ad Corinthios, qui ipsi debebant officium observare; vel etiam ad Paulum ipsum majore coram usurum severitate, ut αὐτός, *ipse*, denotet *ultra*." Hofmann, still referring to

the *collection*, makes the apostle lay emphasis on the fact that this exhortation comes from himself, in contradistinction, namely, from what those others (chap. ix.) will do in his stead and by his order (comp. Bengel's 1st). But the whole matter of the collection was completely ended at ix. 15. After the exclamation of thanksgiving in ix. 15, a παρακαλεῖν of his own in this matter is no longer suitable; and, besides, the emphatic vindication of the apostolic authority in that case would be uncalled for.

does not, like the First, contain some concluding lines in his own hand. But most of the apostle's letters contain nothing of the sort ; and this Epistle in particular, on account of its whole character and on account also of its bearer, stood so little in need of any authentication, if there was to be such a thing, from his own hand, that his enemies would have made themselves ridiculous by doubting the authenticity of the composition. Apart from this, it remains very probable that Paul himself wrote the conclusion of the Epistle, possibly from xiii. 11 onward, without mentioning the fact expressly. — *διὰ τῆς πραότητος καὶ ἐπιεικείας τοῦ Χριστοῦ*, *by means of the meekness and gentleness of Christ ; i.e.* assigning a motive for compliance with my exhortation by pointing to the fact, that Christ, whose example I have to imitate, is so gentle and meek (Matt. xi. 29, 30 ; Isa. xlii. 2, 8, lii. 4–7). Comp. Rom. xii. 1 ; 1 Cor. i. 10. The gentleness and meekness of Christ belong to the *divine* love manifested in Him (Rom. viii. 39 ; Tit. iii. 4 ff.), and are continually shown by Him in His heavenly government, in the working of His grace, in His intercession, etc. Estius designates rightly the *ground* of the motive assigned : “ quia cupiebat non provocari ad severitatem vindictae ” (which would not be in harmony with Christ's meekness and gentleness). On *ἐπιείκεια*, *clementia* (Acts xxiv. 4), which is often found in connection with *πραότης* (as Plut. *Pericl.* 39, *Caes.* 57 ; Philo, *de Vita Mos.* p. 112), comp. Wetstein. It is attributed even to God (2 Macc. x. 4 ; Bar. ii. 27) and to Wisdom (Wisd. xii. 18). Bengel gives the *distinction* of the two words : “ *πραότης* virtus magis absoluta ; *ἐπιείκεια* magis refertur ad alios.” It is the opposite of standing on one's full rights, Plato, *Def.* p. 412 B : *δικαίων κ. συμφερόντων ἐλάττωσις*. — *ὃς κατὰ πρόσωπον μὲν κ.τ.λ.*] *I who, to the face, am indeed humble*, of a subdued, unassuming character among you, but in absence have courage towards you—a malicious opinion of his opponents, designed to counteract the influence of the apostle's letters, which he here appropriates to himself *μιμητικῶς*. Comp. ver. 10. *Κατὰ πρόσωπον*, *coram*, is not a Hebraism, but see Wetstein on the passage ; Hermann, *ad Soph. Trach.* 102 ; Jacobs, *ad Ach. Tat.* p. 612. There is no need to supply anything after *ταπεινός*, neither *εἰμί* nor *ὢν*. On *ταπεινός*, comp. Xen. *Mem.* iii., 10. 5, where it is connected with *ἀνελεύθερος* ; Dem. 1312, 2.

REMARK.—Rückert is wrongly of opinion that the assertion of the opponents had been true, and just on that account had been so ill taken by Paul ; that he belonged to those in whom natural impetuosity is not united with personal courage. Against this there is the testimony of his whole working from Damascus to Rome ; and outpourings like vi. 4 ff. *al.* do not lack internal truth. Comp. besides, passages like Acts xx. 22 ff., xxi. 13, xxiv. 25 ; 2 Cor. xi. 23 ff. *al.* That assertion of his opponents may be explained from the fact that, though there were not wanting disturbing phenomena even at his second arrival in Corinth (ii. 1, xii. 21), it was only subsequently that the evils had become so magnified and multiplied as to necessitate his now *writing* (in our first Epistle) far more severely than he had *spoken* in Corinth.

Ver. 2. After the previous relative clause, the *παρακαλῶ* is in substance resumed by means of *δέομαι δέ*, and that in such a way that *δέ* has its adver-

sative reference in the contents of the relative clause (Hartung, *Partikell.* I. p. 174 ; Klotz, *ad Devar.* p. 377), and the *δέομαι* now substituted for *παρακαλῶ* betrays the increasing earnestness softened by the mention of Christ's gentleness and meekness. Emmerling and Rückert refer *δέομαι* not to the Corinthians, but to *God* : "but I pray God that I when present may not be obliged to act with the confidence and boldness," etc. So also Ewald and Hofmann. But how strangely Paul would have written, if he had left his *παρακαλῶ ὑμᾶς* to stand quite abruptly at the very beginning of the new address ! It is all the more arbitrary not to refer *δέομαι* also to the readers, and not to be willing to supply a *ὑμῶν* with *δέομαι* from the previous *παρακαλῶ ὑμᾶς*. Chrysostom and most expositors rightly give it this reference. And how little does what is attached to *δέομαι* *δέ* (observe especially *ἢ λογιζομαι κ.τ.λ.*) sound like the contents of *prayer* ! — *τὸ μὴ παρὼν θαρρῆσαι κ.τ.λ.*] I entreat *the not being courageous in presence, i.e. that I may not when present* (this *παρὼν* has the emphasis) *be of brave courage with the confidence, etc.* The meaning is : *that you may not let it come to this, that I, etc.* Comp. Chrysostom : *μὴ με ἀναγκάσητε κ.τ.λ.* On the infinitive *with the article*, see Buttmann, *neut. Gr.* p. 225 [E. T. 261]. The *nominative παρὼν* with the infinitive is quite according to Greek usage. See Kühner, II. p. 344 ; Matthiae, p. 1248. The *πεποίθησις* is not specially *fiducia in Deum* (Grotius, against the context), but generally the official *confidentia, assurance*. — *ἢ λογιζομαι τολμῆσαι*] *with which I reckon (am minded) to be bold towards certain people, etc.* On *λογίζομαι*, comp. Herod. vii. 176 ; Xen. *Anab.* ii. 2. 13 ; 1 Macc. iv. 35, vi. 19 ; LXX. 1 Sam. xviii. 25 ; Jer. xxvi. 3 ; and on *τολμῆσαι*, xi. 21 ; Hom. *Il.* x. 232 ; Maetzner, *ad Antiph.* p. 173. Others, such as the Vulgate, Anselm, Luther, Beza, Piscator, Estius, Er. Schmid, Calovius, Bengel, Semler, Schulz, take *λογίζομαι* *passively* (*qua efferrī ducor*, Emmerling). In that case we should have had an *ἀπὼν* with *τολμῆσαι*, because in this lay the most essential point of the hostile criticism ; besides, the boldness of the expression, which lies in the correlation of *λογίζομαι τοὺς λογιζομένους*, would be obliterated. — *ἐπὶ τινὰς τοὺς λογιζομ.*] *against certain, who reckon us, etc.*, is to be connected with *τολμῆσαι*, since only by the erroneous course of taking the previous *λογίζομαι* as passive would the connection with *θαρρῆσαι* be required (Luther, Beza, Estius, Emmerling, also Billroth). — *τινάς* denotes *quosdam, quos nominare nolo*. See on 1 Cor. xv. 12. These are then characterized in their definite quality by *τοὺς λογιζομ.* See on Luke xviii. 9, and Doederl. *ad Oed. Col.* p. 296. — *ὥς κατὰ σάρκα περιπατοῦντας*] *as people who walk according to the standard of the flesh.* *ὥς* with the participle as the object of a verb of believing or saying. See Kühner, II. p. 375. Comp. Rom. viii. 36 ; 1 Cor. iv. 1 ; LXX. Gen. xxxi. 15, *al.* The *περιπατεῖν κατὰ σάρκα* is not an expression of *weakness*,¹ since *περιπατεῖν* denotes the *moral* conduct. Hence the meaning is : *as those, whose way of thinking and of acting follows, not the influence of the Holy Spirit, but the lusts opposed to God, which have their seat in the materio-psychical nature of man.* Comp. on Rom. viii. 4.

¹ Beza : "non alio praesidio freti, quam quod prae nobis ferimus, qui videlicet homines sumus viles, si nihil aliud quam hom-

inem spectes." Comp. Bengel, Mosheim, Flatt, Emmerling, also Billroth.

This general interpretation is not at variance with the context, since, in fact, a *κατὰ σάρκα περιπατεῖν* would have shown such a demeanour in the apostle's position as his opponents blamed him for,—bold at a distance, timid when near, full of the fear of men and of the desire to please men. In that *special* accusation there was therefore expressed this *general* one of the *κατὰ σάρκα περιπατεῖν*; *διέβαλλον γὰρ αὐτὸν ὡς ὑποκριτὴν, ὡς πονηρὸν, ὡς ἀλαζόνα*, Chrysostom. Thus the expression is to be explained from the immediate context, and not of the reproach made to him by the representatives of a false spirituality, that he acted on *too free principles* (Ewald).

Ver. 3 does not introduce the refutation of the previous accusation (so that, with Estius and Billroth, we should have to supply a *quod falsum est*), since *γάρ* may quite naturally find its logical reference in what was expressed before. Nor does it assign the reason for *τῇ πεποιθ. ἡ λογίζομαι τολμῆσαι*, since there is nothing whatever against the reference, which first and most naturally suggests itself, to the *chief thought* of the previous verse. Hence it assigns the reason of the *δεόμαι δὲ κ.τ.λ.*: “I entreat, let me not become bold, etc.; for the position of matters with us is quite different from what the opponents believe: we do not march to the field *κατὰ σάρκα*,” etc. Do not therefore run the risk of this! — *ἐν σαρκὶ γὰρ περιπ.*] Paul wishes to express the thought: for it by no means stands with us so as those think, and hence says: *For, though we walk in the flesh*, for although the existent form of the sinful bodily human nature is the *organ*, in which our conduct of life has its course (*σάρκα μὲν γὰρ περικείμεθα*, Chrysostom), *still we do not take the field according to the flesh*, the *σάρξ* is not the *standard*, according to which our official working, which resembles a campaigning, is carried on. Observe that even in *ἐν σαρκὶ* the notion of the *σάρξ* is not *indifferent*, expressing the mere life of the body (comp. Gal. ii. 20; Phil. i. 22): this is forbidden by what goes before and follows. If taken in this way, *ἐν σαρκὶ περιπ.* would contain something very insignificant, because self-evident, and would form no adequate contrast to *κατὰ σάρκα*—a contrast, which only results when the notion of *σάρξ* is *alike* in both clauses. For the stress of this contrast lies in *ἐν* and *κατά* (*in the flesh*, not *according to the flesh*); instead of *περιπατοῦμεν*, however, there comes in *στρατενόμεθα*, because it was highly appropriate to the context (vv. 1, 2) to give thus a military character to the apostle's *περιπατεῖν* in presence of his enemies (comp. vi. 7). On the idea, comp. 1 Tim. i. 18.

Ver. 4. Reason assigned for the assertion just made *οὐ κ. σ. στρατενόμεθα*, but not a *parenthesis* (Griesbach, Lachmann), since ver. 5 is manifestly a further explanation of the preceding *πρὸς καθαίρ. ὄχυν.*, so that the participles in ver. 5 f. are to be referred to the *logical* subject of the verse before (*ἡμεῖς*). Comp. ix. 11, 13. — That the *στρατενεσθαι* is not *κατὰ σάρκα*, is shown from the fact that the *weapons* of warfare are not *σαρκικά*; for, if the former were the case, so must the latter also. By the *weapons* (comp. vi. 7; Rom. vi. 13, xiii. 12) are to be understood the *means*, which the apostolic activity makes use of in the strife with the hostile powers. — *σαρκικά*] which belong to the life-sphere of the *σάρξ*, so that the *σάρξ*, the sinfully inclined human nature, is their *principium essendi*, and they do not proceed from the Holy

Spirit,¹ as *e.g.* σοφία σαρκική, i. 12, the νοῦς τῆς σαρκός, Col. ii. 18, the whole ἔργα τῆς σαρκ., Gal. v. 19. Now, since fleshly weapons as such are weak (Matt. xxvi. 41 ; Rom. vi. 19), and not in keeping with the aims of the apostolic work, the weapons opposed to them are not designated according to their nature (for it is self-evident that they are ὅπλα πνευματικά), but at once according to their specific potency (comp. 2 Cor. ii. 4), as δυνατὰ τῷ θεῷ. By this the passage only gains in pith, since by virtue of the contrast so expressed in σαρκικά the quality of weakness, and in δυνατὰ τῷ θεῷ the pneumatic nature, are understood *ex adjuncto*. Hence the inference frequently drawn from δυνατὰ τῷ θεῷ, that σαρκικός here must mean *weak*, is too hasty. — δυνατὰ τῷ θεῷ] *mighty for God*, *i.e.* passing with God as mighty, which denotes the true reality of the being mighty, without, however, being a Hebraistic periphrasis for the superlative (Vorstius, Glass, Emmerling, Vater, Flatt). See on ἀστεῖος τῷ θεῷ, Acts vii. 20 ; Bernhardt, p. 83 f. Others, not following this current genuinely Greek usage (for the corresponding Hebrew usage, see Gesenius, *Thesaur.* I. p. 98), have explained it as : *through God*,² or *for God*, *i.e.* so that they are to God a means of showing His power (Billroth ; comp. Chrysostom and Hofmann). But the former would be *superfluous*, since it is self-evident in the case of spiritual weapons, and the latter would *import* something into the words, especially as not God, but Christ (ver. 5), is conceived as the general ; comp. 2 Tim. ii. 3. For the mighty πανοπλία of the Christian, which, along with the special apostolic gifts, is also that of the apostles, see Eph. vi. 14 ff. — πρὸς καθαίρειν ὀχυρωμάτων] *that, for which the weapons are mighty : to the pulling down of strongholds* (Xen. *Hell.* iii. 2. 3 ; very frequent in the books of the Maccabees ; comp. ὀχυρὸς πύργος, τόπος, ὀχυρὰ πόλις, φρουρά, and the like). The τύφος Ἑλληνικός and the ἰσχὺς τῶν σοφισμάτων καὶ τῶν διαλογισμῶν (Chrysostom) are *included* in the phrase. It does not, however, mean these *alone*, nor the “old walls of the Jewish legal system” (Klöpffer), but generally everything, which may be included as belonging to the category of humanly strong and mighty means of resistance to the gospel. Examples of this *figurative* use may be seen in Wetstein and Kypke, and from Philo in Loesner, p. 317. The *pulling down* depicts the making quite powerless and reducing to nought—the καταργεῖν, 1 Cor. i. 28, and καταισχύνειν, 1 Cor. i. 27.

Ver. 5. How the πρὸς καθαίρ. ὀχυρωμ. is executed by the ἡμεῖς (the logical subject in ver. 4) : *inasmuch as we pull down thoughts* (Rom. ii. 15), *i.e.* bring to nothing hostile deliberations, resolutions, plans, calculations, and the like, raising themselves like fortresses against Christ. More precise definitions (Grotius and many others : “ratiocinationes philosophorum,” comp. Ewald ; “subtleties,” Hofmann : “thoughts of their own,” behind which men screen themselves from the urgent knowledge of God) are not warranted by the context, nor yet by the contrast of γνῶσις τ. θ., since this is meant *objectively* (in opposition to de Wette, who understands thoughts of *self-con-*

¹ Chrysostom reckons up such weapons : πλοῦτος, δόξα, δυναστεία, εὐγλωττία, δεινότης, περιδρομαί, κολακείαι, ὑποκρίσεις, τὰ ἄλλα τὰ τούτοις εἰκότα.

² Beza, Grotius, Cornelius à Lapide, Estius, Er. Schmid, Wolf, Bengel, and others ; Erasmus has *afflatu Dei*.

ceited wisdom). Also against Olshausen's opinion, that Paul is censuring specially the pretended wisdom of the *Christ-party*, it is to be observed that he is speaking, not simply of the working against *Corinthian* opponents, but against *enemies in general*. The figurative expression of *destruction* by war, *καθαίρουντες*, was very naturally suggested by the image which had just gone before, and which is immediately afterwards taken up again by *ὑψωμα* (ἐπέμεινε τῇ τροπῇ, ἵνα πλείονα ποιήσῃ τὴν ἔμφασιν, Chrysostom); and the subsequent *ἐπαιρόμ.* emphatically corresponds to it. — καὶ πᾶν ὑψωμα κ.τ.λ.] *and every exalted thing* (rampart, castle, tower, and the like, comp. Aq. Ps. xviii. 34, and see in general, Schleusner, *Thes.* V. p. 427), *which is lifted up against the* (evangelical) *knowledge of God* (the knowledge of God κατ' ἐξοχήν), that this may not become diffused and prevailing. (J^o) The real meaning of the figurative *ὑψωμα* is equivalent to that of *ὀχύρωμα*, ver. 4; the relation to *λογισμούς* is, however, correctly defined by Bengel: "cogitationes species, altitudo genus." — The *enemy*, who is thus vanquished by the destruction of his high places, is πᾶν νόημα, i.e. not *all reason* (Luther; comp. Vulgate: "omnem intellectum"), as if πάντα νοῦν were used, but (comp. on iii. 14, iv. 4) *every creation of thought, every product of the human thinking faculty*. The *λογισμοί* before named belong to this, but Paul here goes on to the *whole general category* of that, which as product of the νοῦς takes the field against Christianity. *All this is by Paul and his companions brought into captivity, and thereby into subordination to Christ*, after the bulwarks are destroyed, etc. Thus the holy war comes to the goal of complete victory. — εἰς τὴν ὑπακοὴν τοῦ Χ.] so that this πᾶν νόημα, which previously was hostile to Christ, now becomes obedient and subject to Christ. By this is expressed the *conversion* to Christ, which is attained through the apostolic working, consequently a leading captive ἀπὸ δουλείας εἰς ἐλευθερίαν, ἀπὸ θανάτου πρὸς ζωὴν, ἐξ ἀπολείας πρὸς σωτηρίαν, Chrysostom. The condition ὑπακοὴ τοῦ Χριστοῦ is conceived of as a *local sphere*, into which the enemy is led captive. Comp. Luke xxi. 24; Tob. i. 10; 1 Kings viii. 46; 3 Esdr. vi. 16; Judith v. 18. Apart from this conception, Paul would have written τῇ ὑπακοῇ τοῦ Χρ'στοῦ, or simply τῷ Χριστῷ. Comp. Rom. vii. 23. Kypke, Zachariae, Flatt, Emmerling, Bretschneider, connect εἰς τ. ὑπακ. τ. Χ. with πᾶν νόημα, and take εἰς as *contra*. But in that case Paul would have written very unintelligibly, and by the change of the preposition (previously κατά) would have simply led the reader astray; besides, the αἰχμαλωτίζοντες, *with-out* εἰς τ. ὑπακ. τ. Χ., would remain open and incomplete; finally, ver. 6 shows that he conceived the ὑπακοὴ Χριστοῦ as the goal of the working, consequently as belonging to αἰχμαλ. Comp. also Rom. i. 5, xvi. 26.

Ver. 6. The reverse side of the αἰχμαλωτίζοντες κ.τ.λ. just expressed. Although, namely, the αἰχμαλ. πᾶν νόημα εἰς τ. ὑπακ. τοῦ Χριστοῦ is the result of the apostolic warfare on the whole and in general, yet there remain *exceptions*—persons, who do not surrender themselves captive to Christ's dominion; there remains *παράκοή* in contradistinction to the ὑπακοή of others. Hence it is a part also of the complete work of victory to *punish* every παρακοή. And this, says Paul, we are in readiness to execute, so soon as, etc. Bengel well says: "Zelus jam adest; prometur, cum tempus erit." Paul

does not speak of the action of *war-captives* at variance with the duty of obedience, to which they are taken bound (Hofmann). For this the threat, which would amount, in fact, to the *avenging of every sin*, would be too strong, and the following ὅταν κ.τ.λ. would not be suitable. The παρακονοντες must still be *enemies* who, after the victory, do not submit to the victor. — ἐν ἐτοίμῳ ἔχοντες] *in promptu habentes*, also in Polyb. ii. 34. 2, and Philo, *Leg. ad Caj.* p. 1011, 1029. See, in general, Wetstein. — ὅταν πληρωθῇ ὑμῶν ἡ ὑπακοή] With this he turns to apply what was previously said of a general tenor (ἐκδικ. πᾶσαν παρακ.) specially to the circumstances of the Corinthians, so that the conduct of the Judaistic teachers, who had intruded into Corinth and directed their doings against Paul, appears especially to be included in πᾶσα παρακοή; and the Corinthian church, a part of which had been led astray by those persons, is represented as not yet completely obedient, but as in the course of developing this complete obedience. When this development shall be completed (which till then makes a claim on my patience, “ne laedantur imbecilliores,” Bengel), that ἐκδίκησις of every disobedience shall—even as respects the situation of things at Corinth—ensue.¹ Thus the apostle separates the interest of the church from that of the intruding seducers, and presents his relation to the *church* as one of forbearance and confidence, while his relation to his *opponents* is one of vengeance delaying its execution only for the sake of the church, which has not yet attained to full obedience—a wise manipulation of the *Divide et impera!*—How he means to execute the ἐκδικεῖν (Rom. xii. 19), he does not say; he *might* do so by ordaining excommunication, by giving them over to Satan (1 Cor. v. 5), or by other exercise of his miraculous apostolic power. — ὑμῶν] is placed first with emphasis, to distinguish the *church* from those whose παρακοή was to be punished. Hofmann, without ground, denies this emphasis, because ὑμῶν does not stand before πληρωθῇ. The emphasis certainly falls, *in the first instance*, on πληρ., and *next* not on ἡ ὑπακ., but on ὑμῶν.

Ver. 7. Paul feels that the ἐξουσία, just described in vv. 3–6, is not conceded to him by his opponents and those misled by them in the church; they judge that he is evidently no right servant of Christ, and that he must come to shame with his boasting (comp. ver. 8). He at once breaks into the midst of this course of thought on the part of his opponents with the disapproving question: *Do you look on that which lies before the eyes?* do you judge according to the appearance? by which he means this, that they profess to have seen him weak and cowardly, when he was in Corinth personally (comp. ver. 1). This does not involve any admission of the charge in ver. 1, but, on the contrary, discloses the error, in accordance with which the charge was based on the apostle's outward appearance, which did not make a display of his boldness. The *answer* to the question is: *If any one is confident that he belongs to Christ, let him judge this again of himself, that*

¹ Lachmann, by a full stop, separates ὅταν πληρ. ὑμ. ἡ ὑπακ. wholly from what goes before, and connects it with what follows, so that the meaning results: “When your obedience shall have become complete, see

to what lies before your eyes.” A precept strangely conditioned! And why should we give up the common punctuation, which yields a delicate touch quite characteristic of Paul?

just as he belongs to Christ, so do we. The opposing teachers had certainly boasted : How utterly different people are we from this Paul, who is bold only at a distance, and makes a boast of belonging as an apostle to Christ ! We are right servants of Christ ! — τὰ κατὰ πρόσωπον βλέπετε] is taken *interrogatively* by Theodoret ;¹ along with which, however, many import into κατὰ πρόσωπον elements at variance with the text (see vv. 1 and 10), such as intercourse with Jesus when on earth and other matters. It is taken as *not interrogative* (Lachmann and Tischendorf), but also with βλέπετε as indicative, and the sentence, consequently, as a *judgment* of censure, by Chrysostom, Gennadius, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Calvin, Schulz, Flatt. Calvin says : “ Magni facitis alios, qui magnis ampullis turgent ; me, quia ostentatione et jactantia careo, despicitis ;” while Flatt, following Storr, in spite of vv. 1 and 10, refers κατὰ πρόσωπον to the kinship of James with Christ, on which the Christine party had relied. In any case, however, it is more lively and forcible, and therefore more suitable, to take it as *interrogative*. Others, again, take βλέπετε as an *imperative* :² *observe withal what lies so clearly before the eyes !* In this view we should not have to explain it with Ewald : “ *regard personal matters ;*” so that Paul begins to point to the personal element which is now to be taken into consideration ; but with Hofmann : the readers only needed to have their eyes open to what lay before them, in order to judge rightly. But against this it may be urged that κατὰ πρόσωπον could not but most naturally explain itself from ver. 1, and that the meaning itself would have something tame and more calmly argumentative, than would be suited to the lively emotion of the passage. Besides, it is Paul’s custom elsewhere to put βλέπετε first, when he summons to an *intuemini*. See 1 Cor. i. 26, x. 18 ; Phil. iii. 2. — εἰ τις πέποιθεν ἑαυτῷ Χριστοῦ εἶναι] In this way is designated the confidence which his opponents (not a single peculiar false teacher, as Michaelis thinks) arrogantly cherished for themselves, but denied to Paul, that they were genuine Christ-people, genuine servants of Christ. The addition of δοῦλος to Χριστοῦ in D* E* F G, It. Ambrosiaster, is a correct gloss (comp. xi. 23). For it is not the *confiteor* of the Christine party (1 Cor. i. 12) that is meant here,³ but the assertion—to the exaltation of themselves and the exclusion of Paul—of a true apostolic connection (through calling, gifts, etc.) with Christ⁴ on the part of Judaistic pseudo-apostles (xi. 5, xiii. 22, 23). Observe that the *teachers* here meant were not a party of the church, like the adherents of Christ designated in 1 Cor. i. 12. The very οὕτω καὶ ἡμεῖς, compared with ver. 8,—to say nothing

¹ Erasmus, Luther, Castalio, Cajetan, Beza, Grotius, Calovius, Wolf, Hammond, Bengel, Heumann, Rosenmüller, Emmerling, Rübiger, Osiander, Klöpper, and others.

² Vulgate, Ambrosiaster, Anselm, Cornelius à Lapide, Billroth, Rückert, Olshausen, de Wette, Bisping, Hofmann.

³ Mosheim, Stolz, Flatt, comp. also Olshausen, Dähne, de Wette, Schenkel, Beyschlag, Hilgenfeld, Klöpper, and others ; see against this, Neander, I. p. 393 ff., and

also Hofmann.

⁴ Not with His *disciples*, and in particular with *Peter*, as Baur insinuates. See his *Paulus*, I. p. 306, ed. 2. It was in his view the original apostles as immediate disciples of the Lord (see also Holsten, *z. Evang. des Paul. u. Petr.* p. 24 ff.), from whose position the anti-Pauline party in Corinth had borrowed their watchword Χριστοῦ εἶναι. And in these his opponents Paul was at the same time combating the original apostles.

of the fact that there is no hint of any such special reference,—precludes our explaining it of the continued *immediate* connection with Christ through *visions* and the like, of which the heads of the Christine party had probably boasted (de Wette, Dähne, Goldhorn, and others, following Schenkel). — πάλιν] not : *on the contrary*, or *on the other hand*, which it never means in the N. T. (see on Matt. iv. 7, and Fritzsche, *ad Matt.* p. 167), but, *again*, *denuo*. It refers to ἐφ' ἑαυτοῦ, which is correlative to the previous ἐαυτῷ. He is confident *to himself*; let him then consider once more *for himself*. In this view there was no need of the shift to which Fritzsche has recourse, that πεποιθέναι and λογίζεσθαι “*communem continent mente volvendi notionem*.” The verbs might be quite heterogeneous in point of the notion conveyed, since πάλιν is logically defined by the relation of ἐαυτῷ and ἐαυτοῦ. —The *Recepta* ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ, instead of which, however, ἐφ' ἑαυτοῦ is to be read¹ would mean *proprio motu*, Luke xii. 57, xxi. 30, 2 Cor. iii. 5, *i.e.* without any need for one first to say it to him. The text gives no warrant for *ironical* interpretation (from his own high estimate, Rückert). — οὕτω καὶ ἡμεῖς] is a *litotes* from the apostle's point of view. Οὐ γὰρ βούλεται ἐκ προοιμίων σφοδρὸς γίνεσθαι ἀλλὰ κατὰ μικρὸν αὖξεται καὶ κορυφοῦται, Chrysostom.

Ver. 8. Proof of the οὕτω καὶ ἡμεῖς from his apostolic authority, which was yet greater than he had already represented it. — τὲ γάρ] *etenim*, as in Rom. i. 26, vii. 7. See on these passages, and Hermann, *ad Soph. Trach.* 1015; regarding the independent usage frequent in the later Attic, see Klotz, *ad Devar.* p. 750 f. — ἐάν] is not used *concessively* (Rückert; not even 1 Cor. iv. 15, xiii. 1 ff.), but puts a case as a conception of the speaker, in which the realization remains left to experience : *for, in case that I shall have boasted myself yet something more* (than has been already done by me in vv. 3–6) *of the authority*, etc., *I shall not be put to shame*, it will be apparent that I have not been practising empty boasting of which I should have to be ashamed. περισσότ. τι is accusative of object, like τί, vii. 11. See on ix. 2. The reference of the comparative to what was said in ver. 7 (Osiander, Hofmann, following older commentators) has against it the fact that Paul, in ver. 7, has not spoken of an ἐξουσία; and to take περὶ τ. ἐξουσι. ἡμ. as an element, added only by way of supplement, would be all the more arbitrary, since, in fact, what follows is attached to it significantly. It is taken too generally by Grotius and others : *plus quam alii possent*, or as : “*somewhat more amply*” (Ewald; comp. Billroth and Olshausen). On τ. ἐξουσίας κ.τ.λ., comp. xiii. 10. — ἥς ἔδωκεν ὁ κύριος εἰς οἰκοδομὴν κ.τ.λ.] significant more precise definition of the previous ἡμῶν, with a double side-glance at the false apostles, whose power neither was from Christ nor redounded to edification (perfection of the Christian life), but rather to the destruction of the church. (κ⁶) Paul conceives of the church as a temple of God, which the apostolic

¹ The reading ἐφ' ἑαυτοῦ (Lachm. ed min.), supported by B L & 21, is not meaningless (Ewald), but is to be taken : *with himself*, in quietness *for himself*—a classic usage since Homer (*Il.* vii. 195, xix. 255; see Faesi on these passages) of very frequent occurrence; see Kühner, *II.* p. 296. The transla-

tion *apud se* in the Vulg. and It. also rests on this reading, which might easily enough be supplanted by the better known ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ, and hence deserves to be preferred. There lies in this ἐφ' ἑαυτοῦ (*secum solo reputet*) a reproof putting more delicately to shame than in ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ.

teachers are building (1 Cor. iii. 16 ; comp. on Rom. xiv. 19); and he is conscious that he will, in the event of his making a still greater boast of that, not be put to shame, but see himself justified by the result of his work. Observe the interchange of plural (ἐξουσ. ἡμ.) and singular. Olshausen, in an arbitrary and involved way, connects εἰς οἰκοδ. with καυχῆσμαι, holding that there is an anticipation of the thought, so that, according to the meaning, it ought to have run : οὐκ αἰσχυνθήσομαι, ἐγένετο γὰρ εἰς κ.τ.λ. — οὐκ αἰσχυνθ.] *when?* in every case of the *future generally*. There is no indication in the text of a limitation to the *last day* (Ewald). Even on his arrival at Corinth he expected that he should experience no cause for shame.

Ver. 9 is taken by Chrysostom¹ as the protasis of ver. 11, so that ver. 10 becomes a parenthesis. But by Erasmus, Luther, Castalio, Beza, Grotius, Bengel, and others, also Billroth and Schrader, it is attached to ver. 8, in which case, however, some (Beza, Bengel, comp. Billroth) supply before ἵνα a “*quod ego idcirco dico*,” others (Grotius, comp. Erasmus): “*non addam plura ea de re*.” The latter is pure invention ; and from the supplement of Beza there would not at all logically result what is said in ver. 9. No ; let ἵνα μὴ δόξω κ.τ.λ. be joined *immediately*, without assuming any intervening thought, to οὐκ αἰσχυνθήσομαι : *I shall not be put to shame* (now comes the *definition*, in a negative form, *of the divine aim* with reference to the charge in question) *in order that I may not appear*, etc., that the matter may not remain on the footing of the mere word, but it may be apparent in point of fact that I am something quite other than the man who wishes to frighten you by his letters. If in this way the passage proceeds simply and correctly without logical difficulty, the less simple connection of Chrysostom *et al.* (see above) is superfluous, and is, moreover, not to be accepted, *because* the new part of the passage would begin, in a very palpably abrupt way, with ἵνα without any connecting particle,² and because what Paul says in ver. 11 could not destroy the appearance indicated in ver. 9, to which belonged *matter of fact*. — ὥς ἂν ἐκφοβεῖν ὑμᾶς] The Vulgate rightly has : “*tanquam terrere vos*,” and Beza : “*ceu perterrefacere vos*.” The ὥς ἂν modestly takes away from the harsh and strong ἐκφοβεῖν the offensiveness, which in the feeling of the apostle it would have had, if taken by itself and in its full sense. It is not *modal* (“*in any way*,” Hofmann), but *comparative*, corresponding quite to our modifying *as* [German *wie*] : that I may not appear *to put you as in dread*. In later Greek ὥς ἂν certainly has the meaning *tanquam, quasi*, ἂν having lost its specific reference. See Hermann, *de part. ἂν*, 4. 3, p. 184 ; Bornemann, *in d. Sächs. Stud.* 1846, p. 61 ; Buttmann, *neut. Gram.* p. 189 [E. T. 219]. To resolve it into ὥς ἂν ἐκφοβοῖμι ὑμᾶς (Olshausen) is arbitrary, as if it were *oratio directa*. The classical ὥς ἂν with optative and subjunctive (Klotz, *ad Devar.* p. 767), as in 1 Thess. ii. 7, is not to be brought into comparison here. — διὰ τῶν ἐπιστ.] namely, which I

¹ Calvin, Schulz, Morus, Zachariae, Emmerling, Vater, Rückert, Olshausen, de Wette, Ewald, Maier, Hofmann.

² Hence also at a very early time there

crept in after ἵνα a δέ, which we still find in Syr. Vulg. Chrys. Theophyl. Pel. Ambrosiast. and several cursives.

write to you (*article*); he had already written two. The *plural* does not justify the hypothesis of a third letter already written (Bleek). — The compound ἐκφοβεῖν (comp. ἐκφοβος, Mark ix. 6; Heb. xii. 21) is stronger than the simple form, Plato, *Gorg.* p. 483 C; *Ep.* 3, p. 318 B; Thuc. iii. 42. 4; Polyb. xiv. 10. 3; Wisd. xvii. 9, 19; 1 Macc. xiv. 17.

Ver. 10. *For his letters, it is said, are weighty and strong; his bodily presence, however, is powerless* (when present in body, he acts without power and energy) *and his speech despised*, his oral teaching, exhortation, etc., find no respect, are held of little account. Comp. ver. 1. For the apostle's own commentary on the second part of this assertion of his opponents, see 1 Cor. ii. 3, 4. Quite at variance with the context, some have found here also *bodily weakness* (Witsius in Wolf; recently, in particular, Holsten, *zum Ev. d. Paul. u. Petr.* p. 85), and a *weak utterance* (Er. Schmid). Besides, the tradition is very uncertain and late, which pronounces Paul to have been μικρὸν καὶ συνεσταλμένον τὸ τοῦ σώματος μέγεθος (Niceph. Call. ii. 37). Comp. on Acts xiv. 12.—The opposite of ισχυραί, *powerful*, is ἀσθενής. — Οὐ βαρεῖαι, comp. Wetstein. The *gravitas* is imposing and instils respect; hence the opposite ἐξουθενημ. — φησι] *it is said*, impersonal, as often with the Greeks. See Bernhardt, p. 419. The reading φασίν (Lachmann, following B, Vulg.) is a rash correction. Comp. Fritzsche, *ad Thesmoph.* p. 189; Buttmann, *neut. Gram.* p. 119 [E. T. 136]. (L⁶)

Ver. 11. After ver. 10 a full stop is to be put (see on ver. 9), so that now, without any connecting particle, but with the more striking force, there follows what is suggested for the consideration of the person judging in such wise. — τοιοῦτοι καὶ παρόντες τῷ ἔργῳ] *sc. ἐσμέν*. Such a double part we do not play.

Ver. 12.¹ Reason assigned for this assurance (οἰοί ἐσμεν . . . τῷ ἔργῳ): for we are not like our boastful opponents, but, etc. If we were such people as they are, word and work might doubtless not harmonize in our case. — οὐ γὰρ τολμῶμεν κ.τ.λ.] *for we do not venture to number ourselves among, or compare ourselves, with certain people among those who commend themselves; but they,*² *measuring themselves by themselves, and comparing themselves with themselves, are not rational; we, on the other hand, will not make our boast beyond measure, but, etc., ver. 13.* In οὐ τολμῶμεν is implied an *irony* which shows the want of humility in those people. Bengel aptly says: “sepem inter se et illos ponit.” — ἐγκρίναι] *annumerare*, to place in one category; *inserere*, as the Vulgate rightly has it (Hor. *Od.* i. 1. 35; construed with εἰς, μετά, ἐπί with genitive, and with the simple dative of the persons joined (Apoll. Rhod. i. 48. 227). See Wetstein and Kypke, II. p. 264. — συγκρίναι] *might* mean the same (Morus, Rosenmüller, Flatt, Reiche, and several, following the Peshitto), but is defined by συγκρίνοντες in the contrasting clause as having the meaning *comparare*

¹ This passage is most thoroughly discussed by Fritzsche, *Dissert.* II. p. 33 ff. (whom Billroth has entirely followed), and by Reiche, *Commentar. crit.* I. p. 375 ff. Theodoret remarks: ἀσαφῶς ἀπαν τὸ χώρημα τοῦτο γέγραφεν, and for this he advances as a reason: ἐναργῶς ἐλέγξει τοὺς

αἰτίους οὐ βουλόμενος.

² This emphasized *they* (αὐτοί, *they on their part*) is fully justified in contrast to the following ἡμεῖς; hence it is not, with Osiander, to be taken in the sense of *solī*, in its limitation to themselves.

(Vulgate), which it very often has in later Greek, as also in Wisd. vii. 29, xv. 18, equivalent to παραβάλλειν in Polyb. i. 2. 1, xii. 12. 1.¹ See, in general, Lobeck, *ad Phryn.* p. 278. Comp. Loesner, *Obs.* p. 273. Observe, moreover, the *paronomasia* of the two verbs, something like *inferre aut conferre*, the German *zurechnen oder gleichrechnen*; Ewald: *eingleichen oder vergleichen* [*reckon to or reckon like*]. — τισι] as in ver. 2, not: *even the least* of them (Hofmann). — τῶν ἐαυτ. συνιστ.] This is the class of men, to which the τινές belong. — ἀλλά] introduces the opposite in such a way *that the procedure of the two parties is placed antithetically in juxtaposition*: “We do not venture to reckon ourselves to or compare ourselves with them, but they proceed thus, we, on the other hand, thus.” We do not venture, etc., but between them and us there subsists the contrast, which does away with that ἐγκρίναι ἢ συγκρίναι κ.τ.λ., that *they*, etc., whereas *we*, etc. — αὐτοὶ down to οὐ συνιοῦσιν applies to the hostile τινές, and on this point one half of the expositors are agreed. But συνιοῦσιν, which is therefore not to be accented συνίουσιν (comp. on Rom. iii. 11), is not a *participle* (Chrysostom), so that it would be definition of quality to ἐαυτοῖς, which would quite unnecessarily make an anacoluthon, but it is the third person plural (Matt. xiii. 13) for the Attic συνιᾶσιν, which is read by Lachmann, following B s**—so that ἐν ἐαυτοῖς ἐαυτοὺς μετροῦντες κ. συγκρ. ἐαυτ. ἐαυτοῖς is the point, in which the opponents show their irrationality (*inasmuch as they measure themselves by themselves . . . they are irrational*), and not the object of οὐ συνιοῦσιν (*they do not know that they measure themselves by themselves*), as Erasmus, Castalio, Beza, Estius, Grotius, Er. Schmid, Wolf, and several have held. To this last view, indeed, there is no grammatical objection (Valckenaer, *ad Herod.* III. 1, and on the distinction from the infinitive construction, Kühner, II. p. 357), but it would yield an inappropriate meaning; for the contrast ἡμεῖς δὲ κ.τ.λ. shows that Paul did not mean to bring into prominence the blindness of his opponents towards their foolish conduct, but the folly of this procedure itself, whereas *he* proceeds quite otherwise. When those people measure themselves by themselves, judge themselves by their own personality, and compare themselves with this instead of with persons working more and better,² they are in this presumption of theirs (comp. Chrysostom 1) *irrational, ineptiunt, οὐ συνιοῦσι*. This, however, is not to be defined more precisely by arbitrary additions, such as: they do not know *how ridiculous they make themselves* (Chrysostom 2, Theophylact), or *how arrogant they are* (Occumenius), or *what they are talking about* (Augustine). Comp. rather Rom. iii. 11;

¹ The objects compared may be of *similar* or *dissimilar* nature. On this point the *word* does not determine anything.

² Such an one thinks: what a great man I am, for how much I know and can do! how I even excel myself, etc.! His own *ego* is thus *object and canon* of the measuring and judging. Calvin aptly illustrates this by the example of the ignorant and yet so conceited monks. The juxtaposition of αὐτοὶ ἐν ἐαυτοῖς ἐαυτοὺς *palliates* the conceit of the selfish nature. Comp. Plato, *Protag.* p.

347 E: αὐτοὶ δ' ἐαυτοῖς σύνεισι δι' ἐαυτῶν. It is well paraphrased by Reiche, p. 380: “sibi ipsis e vana sua de se opinione virtutum meritorumque modulum constituentes atque se sibi solis comparantes, non potioribus meliusque meritis, quod si fecerint, illico quam sint nihil ipsi cognoscerent.” Hofmann, again, deals in subtleties, referring ἐν ἐαυτοῖς not only to the first, but also to the second participle, and (see against this, below) connecting the concluding ἐαυτοῖς with the following verb.

Matt. xiii. 13, *al.* Hofmann prefers the reading of $\aleph^*$ 93 : *συνίσασιν* (comp. on this Attic form, Acts xxvi. 4, and see Buttmann, *Ausf. Sprachl.* p. 548 ff.), and attaches *ἐαυτοῖς* to it : *they are not conscious of this, that they only measure themselves and compare themselves, i.e. that only within their own selves they form their judgment respecting themselves, how far they are capable of apprehending, and to whom they are entitled to rank themselves equal.* But the reading *συνίσασιν* can only be regarded as a copyist's error, through which, instead of *συνιᾶσιν* (Lachmann), there crept in the word *συνίσασιν* well known from the Attic writers (*e.g.* Soph. *El.* 93 ; Xen. *Cyrop.* iii. 1. 9), and this in turn was at once amended by the corrector A. And in no case can *ἐαυτοῖς* be separated from *συγκρίνοντες*, since *συγκρίνειν* in itself is an *incomplete* notion, which necessarily requires a specification of that *with which* comparison is made. Hofmann's view is at once *uncritical* and *illogical*, apart from the fact that it very much disturbs the purposely chosen symmetry of the two participial definitions ; hence it is also *formally* unsuitable. — The *second* half of the expositors (Chrysostom hesitates between the two views) refer *αὐτοὶ . . . συνιοῦσιν* to Paul, and consider *συνιοῦσιν* (to be written *συνίουσιν*) as a *participle*, so that the measuring self by self, etc. appears to be the *right* kind of judgment.¹ Comp. Horace, *Ep.* i. 7. 98 : “Metiri se quemque suo modulo ac pede verum est.” In this case *either* (a) *οὐ συνιοῦσιν* is considered as in contrast with *ἐαυτοῖς* : *with ourselves, not with wise people*, by which the conceited opponents would be ironically meant (Bos, Homberg, Schrader). Or (b) *ἀλλὰ . . . ἐαυτοὺς ἐαυτοῖς* is taken as parenthesis, and *οὐ συνιοῦσι* as one conception in apposition to *τισὶ τῶν ἐαυτ. συνιστ.* (Schulz). Or (c) *οὐ συνιοῦσιν* is taken as apposition to the preceding *ἐαυτοῖς* : “neque existimo ex me, homine, ut istis placet, insipido,” Emmerling, whom Olshausen follows. All these views take the participles for the finite tenses (or rather as *anacoluthic*) ; but against them all the following *ἡμεῖς δέ* is decisive, which makes it logically necessary to refer *αὐτοί* to the *opponents* ; for it cannot, as Emmerling and Olshausen think, form a logical contrast to the charge which is alleged to be implied in *οὐ συνιοῦσιν*, since *ἡμεῖς δέ* would require to be put in antithesis to the accusers, and not to the accusation (which, besides, would only be expressed quite cursorily and indirectly by *οὐ συνιοῦσιν*). Further, there may be urged against (a), that it would require *οὐ τοῖς συνιοῦσιν* with the article ; against (b), that this interpretation is involved ; against (c), not so much the want of the article—for *οὐ συνιοῦσιν* need not be in apposition, but might also be an accompanying definition of *ἐαυτοῖς*—as the fact that there is no hint in the context of any ironical adducing of such a charge, and hence it is not to be compared with xi. 1, 16, 19, xii. 11. (LL⁶)

REMARK 1.—Against our explanation,² it has been objected (see especially Fritzsche and Billroth) that *ἀλλὰ αὐτοὶ κ.τ.λ.* cannot apply to the opponents,

¹ According to Emmerling, *μετρ. ἐαυτ. ἐν ἐαυτ.* applies to abstinence from promises which transcend their powers, and the *συγκρίν. ἐαυτ. ἐαυτοῖς* to the “judicium ferre de se ad normam virium suarum, factorum et meritorum.” According to Olshausen, *ἐν*

ἐαυτοῖς ἐαυτοὺς μετροῦντες is intended to mean : we measure ourselves *by what the Lord has imposed on us!*

² Which is found in substance also in Augustine, Chrysostom 1, Theodoret, Theophylact, Luther, Calvin, Hammond, Wet-

because manifestly different *modes of dealing*, and not different *persons*, would be opposed to each other, in which case Paul could not but have written : ἡμεῖς γὰρ οὐ . . . ἀλλὰ αὐτοὶ κ.τ.λ. But by this very contrast of *persons* first introduced by ἀλλά (ἀλλὰ αὐτοὶ . . . ἡμεῖς δέ) the opposite of the *mode of action* previously negatived is exhibited in a truly concrete and vivid way, and by no means illogically, seeing that in fact by the previous εαυτοὺς τισί the contrast of *persons* introduced with ἀλλά was very naturally suggested. On the other hand, it would not have been logical, if Paul had written ἡμεῖς γὰρ οὐ τολμῶμεν . . . ἀλλὰ αὐτοὶ κ.τ.λ., since then doubtless the *persons*, but not *that which is asserted* of the *persons*, would stand in logical contrast with one another ; for what is asserted would need to be substantially in both clauses *one and the same* thing, which would be denied of the ἡμεῖς, and affirmed of the αὐτοί. It has been objected to our explanation of οὐ συνιοῦσιν that it is against the context ; but it is, in point of fact, to be observed, that on the one hand it gives a very delicate explanation concerning the ironical οὐ τολμῶμεν, and that on the other hand the following ἡμεῖς δὲ κ.τ.λ. with logical accuracy opposes to the previous ἀλλὰ αὐτοὶ κ.τ.λ. the thought : we, however, abide by the measure which *God* has imparted to us, so that in κατὰ τὸ μέτρον τοῦ κανόνος, οὐ ἐμέρ. ἡμ. ὁ θεὸς μέτρον there lies the contrast to the irrational procedure of the opponents measuring themselves *by themselves*. He who measures himself by himself, seeing that in fact he lacks an objective standard, falls with his boasting εἰς τὰ ἄμετρα, like those opponents ; but not he, who knows himself determined by a limit set by God. Finally, the objection, that by our interpretation οὐ συνιοῦσιν gets a thought imported into it which its literal tenor does not actually present (Hofmann), is quite groundless, since οὐ, by a quite common usage, turns the συνιοῦσιν into its opposite, consequently οὐ συν. expresses the ἀσυνεσία, the irrationality and folly of those men in their procedure.

REMARK 2.—By leaving out οὐ συνιοῦσιν· ἡμεῖς δέ, but retaining καυχησόμεθα, ver. 13 (see the critical remarks), the meaning results : “*sed me ex meo modulo metiens mihi me conferens, non praeter modum, sed ad modum ita mihi praefiniti spatii, ut ad vos quoque pervenirem, gloriabor*” (Fritzsche).¹ But if καυχησόμεθα also is left out, as Fritzsche and Billroth approve, Paul in ver. 15 turns back to οὐκ εἰς τὰ ἄμετρα in ver. 13, and then adds the still necessary verb anacoluthically in the participle : “*sed me ipse mihi conferens, non praeter modum . . . ver. 15, non praeter modum inquam me efferens*” (Fritzsche). The suitableness of the meaning and of the antithetic character in the several parts, as well as the unexceptionable warrant of the anacoluthon, have been aptly shown by Fritzsche, pp. 41, 43 f. But the rejected words cannot thereby be deprived of their critical title to exist.

Ver. 13. Εἰς τὰ ἄμετρα] so that we with our καυχᾶσθαι go *beyond measure*, go into limitless extravagance. This is what is done by the man who measures

stein, Zachariae, and others, including Rückert, Reiche, Neander, Osiander, Kling, partly also in Hofmann.

¹ Comp. Ewald : “*but modestly and cautiously measuring ourselves by ourselves and our abilities, and comparing ourselves with ourselves and our labours already achieved and clear before the world and before God,*

we will not (like those intruders) *boast without measure*, but at most will boast *according to the measure of the standard which God imparted to us as measure*, and which accordingly among other things authorized and strengthened us, *that we attained even unto you and founded you.*”

himself by himself, because in that case no check external to himself is put on his imagination and self-exaltation. Such a man certainly has *an object* of the *καυχᾶσθαι*, and is not simply *aiming at the having* one (Hofmann), which would yield an absurd idea ; but he has no bounds in the manner and degree of his *καυχᾶσθαι* ; he is wanting in *μετριότης*. Regarding the use of *εἰς* with an adjective of degree and the article, see Viger. ed. Herm. p. 596 ; Matthiae, p. 1349. On the expression itself, comp. Homer, *Il.* ii. 212, where Thersites is called ἀμετροεπής. — *καυχησόμεθα*] The *future* asserts that this case *will not occur*. Comp. Rom. x. 14, *al.* ; Dissen, *ad Dem. de Cor.* p. 369. — ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὸ μέτρον τοῦ κανόνος, οὗ κ.τ.λ.] *sc. καυχησόμεθα* : but according to the measure of the boundary-line, which God (not our own choice) has assigned to us as measure, to reach even unto you, *i.e.* but our boasting will restrict and measure itself according to the limit which God has drawn for us, and by which He has measured off the sphere of our activity, in order that we should reach even to you with our working. By this Paul is manifestly aiming at the vaingloriousness of the false apostles, who decked themselves with extraneous feathers, inasmuch as they intruded into the provinces of others, into spheres which had not been assigned to them by God as the measure of their activity : as, indeed, in particular they had come also to Corinth, which lay within the boundary-line of *Paul's* apostolic action, and were now boasting as if the church-life in Corinth were chiefly *their* work. For, although they could not give themselves out to be the *founders* of the church (Baur, *Tüb. Zeitschr.* 1832, 4, p. 101), they could still put forward as *their* merit the rapid growth of the church and many points of detail, and thereby presume to put the apostle in the shade. Olshausen thinks that the false apostles had appropriated to themselves Corinth as *their* province, because they had already been at work there *before* Paul ; but that the latter had still felt himself at liberty to preach in Corinth, because no *apostle* had been there before him. This is an hypothesis quite as superfluous as it is unhistorical, since neither in the Book of Acts is there found any trace of Christianity at Corinth before Paul's arrival, nor in the Epistles, in which, on the contrary, he states expressly that he was the *first* to preach there (1 Cor. iii. 6, 10), and that all other teachers had entered later into the work (1 Cor. iv. 15). — κατὰ τὸ μέτρον τοῦ κανόνος] Here τὸ μέτρον is *the measure defined for the καυχᾶσθαι*, as is clear from the previous οὐ χιεῖς τὰ ἄμετρα καυχ., —and τοῦ κανόνος is the *genitivus subjecti*: *the measure given by the drawn measuring-line*. And the subsequent *μετροῦ*¹ is an apposition to τοῦ κανόνος not at all unnatural (as Hofmann declares it), but attracted by the relative clause according to a very frequent Greek usage (see Bernhardt, p. 302 ;

¹ For which Grotius ought not to have conjectured μέτρον. But the most mistaken view as regards μέτρον is that lighted on by Hofmann, who attaches it to ὁ θεός: "*the God of measure*," by which, in his view, it is affirmed that "to everything God sets some sort of measure." As if this singular way of designating God (altogether different from such appellations as: the God of

glory, of peace, of love, of hope, and the like) were even possible without the article before μέτρον ! In Wisd. ix. 1, πατέρων required no article, according to the well-known anarthrous usage of πατήρ in the singular and plural ; and in Ecclus. xxxiii. 1, πάντων without the article is quite according to rule.

Pflugk, *ad. Eur. Hec.* 771 ; Stallbaum, *ad. Plat. Phaed.* p. 66 E ; *Rep.* p. 402 C ; Buttmann, *neut. Gr.* p. 246 [E. T. 286]) ; consequently not again the measure of the *boasting*, but, as appears from the definition of the object aimed at ἐφικέσθαι ἄχρι κ. ὑμῶν, the *spatial measure*, namely, how far one is to reach (see what follows), or, dropping the figure : *the measure of extent of the destined working*. Paul, namely, conceives of the local extension assigned to his official working as a space marked out by God with a measuring-line, in which he takes his stand and is able to reach to all points of it without unduly stretching or straining himself, ver. 14. Hence : ἐφικέσθαι ἄχρι καὶ ὑμῶν, which is not simply exegetical (Hofmann), nor does it express the consequence (Rückert, de Wette), but is, in accordance with the notion of ἐμέρ., to be taken as infinitive of *definition* of οὐ ἐμέρ. ἡμ. ὁ θεὸς μέτρον. — κανὼν does not mean *sphere of vocation* (Flatt and many others), but *measuring-rod, measuring-line*. Here the latter. Comp. Gal. vi. 16 ; Aq. Job xxxviii. 5 ; Ps. xviii. 4. See in general, Duncan, *Lex.* ed. Rost. p. 587 f. On μερίζειν τινί τι, to *impart something to one, assign* as one's share, comp. Rom. xii. 3 ; 1 Cor. vii. 17 ; Heb. vii. 23 ; Polyb. xi. 28. 9, xxxi. 18. 3. The ἐφικνεῖσθαι is, in keeping with the figurative representation of the state of the matter (see especially ver. 14), not to *arrive at* (Hofmann), which is only expressed by ἐφθάσαμεν, but to *reach to, pertingere*, as the Vulgate aptly renders it. The word is found nowhere else in the N. T., and is here *selected* for the sense indicated. Comp. Xen. *Cyr.* i. 1. 5, v. 5. 8 ; Plut. *Mor.* p. 190 E ; Lucian, *Jup. conf.* 19, *al.* ; also Eccclus. xliii. 27, 30. The Corinthians, because not to be found beyond the bounds of his κανὼν, were to the apostle ἐφικτοί, *reachable*.

Ver. 14. A parenthetical (see on ver. 15) confirmation of ἐφικέσθαι ἄχρι καὶ ὑμῶν : *for not, as though we were such as do not reach to you, do we overstretch ourselves, i.e., dropping the figure : for we do not usurp for ourselves any extension of our working at variance with its destined limit, as would be the case, if you lay beyond the measured-off province which is divinely assigned to us*. Paul abides by his figure : for if he were not *destined* to extend his official working even to Corinth, and yet *wished* to do so, he would resemble a man who stretches himself beyond the boundary-line drawn for him, in order to reach to a point that lies beyond the limits which he is forbidden to overpass. — ὥς μὴ ἐφικν. εἰς ὑμᾶς] ἐφικν. is to be taken in no other sense than the previous ἐφικέσθαι. The *present*, however, denotes : *as though we were persons, in whose case the reaching to you does not occur, i.e. whose position within their measured local district implies that you are not capable of being reached by them, because, forsooth, you lie beyond the limits of this district*. Luther, Beza, and many others, overlooking this continuation of *the figure*, and taking ἐφικνούμενοι, in spite of the present (and in spite of the present ὑπερεκτείνουμεν), *historically*, have explained it : *ut si non pervenissemus*, from which error there has sprung the participle of the second aorist, supported by very weak evidence, and yet preferred by Billroth. Regarding μὴ, Winer, p. 442 [E. T. 595], very correctly remarks : “a mere conception ; in point of fact, the state of the case is otherwise ; compare, on the other hand, 1 Cor. ix. 26.” — ἄχρι γὰρ καὶ ὑμῶν κ.τ.λ.] This

is now the *historical* position of the case, in confirmation of what was just *figuratively* expressed by οὐ γὰρ . . . ἐαυτούς. How fraught with shame must the sum of recollections, which this simple historical fact embraced, have been for the misled portion of the church ! ἐφθάσαμεν is simply : *we have arrived at* (Rom. ix. 31 ; Phil. iii. 16 ; Matt. xii. 28 ; 1 Thess. ii. 16), not : *we have arrived before* (sooner than the opponents, Osiander, comp. Ewald). This important point Paul must have *denoted* by some such expression as ἐφθάσ. ἐκείνους (comp. 1 Thess. iv. 15). — ἐν τῷ εὐαγγ. τ. X.] The gospel of Christ is conceived as the official element in which the ἐφθάσαμεν took place : in the matter of the gospel, *i.e. in functione evangelica* (Bengel). Comp. Rom. i. 9 ; 2 Cor. viii. 18 ; Phil. iv. 3 ; 1 Thess. iii. 2. (M⁶)

Ver. 15. As οὐκ εἰς τὰ ἄμετρα κανχ. is evidently intended to resume the οὐχὶ εἰς τὰ ἄμετρα κανχ. in ver. 13, and as ver. 14 is merely a confirmatory statement occasioned by ἐφικέσθαι ἄχρι κ. ὑμῶν, it is most natural and logically most suitable, with Lachmann, Osiander, Ewald, to place the whole of ver. 14 in a parenthesis (not the *second* half of the verse merely, as is done by Griesbach, Scholz, de Wette, Hofmann), so that κανχώμενοι depends on the κανχησόμεθα to be supplied in the second clause of ver. 13, not on οὐ γὰρ . . . ὑπερεκτείν. ἐαυτούς (de Wette, Hofmann). To attach it, with Rückert (comp. Tischendorf), to ἐφθάσαμεν is quite unsuitable, because the latter contains an *historical* remark,—only made, moreover, in passing,—and thus *heterogeneous* elements would be combined. — ἐν ἄλλοτρίοις κόποις] object of the negatived εἰς τὰ ἄμετρα κανχᾶσθαι. With his opponents it was the case that their unmeasured boasting referred to labours which were done by others, but were boasted of by them as *their work*. — ἐλπίδα δὲ ἔχοντες] *but having doubtless hope, when your faith increases, to become large among you according to our rule abundantly, i.e. but doubtless hoping, with the growth of your faith, to attain among you this, that starting from you we may be able still further abundantly to extend our working according to the measure of our destination.* This meaning Paul expresses figuratively, and that with faithful adherence to the figure used in vv. 13, 14. He, namely, who *can work far off*, is a man of *great stature*, who without overstretching himself reaches afar ; hence μεγαλυνθῆναι.¹ Further : because Paul still thinks of working

¹ μεγαλ. is by most taken as *celebrari*, which departs from the figure and hence is at variance with the context (Luke i. 46 ; Acts v. 13, x. 46, xix. 17 ; Phil. i. 20). So Flatt, Biliroth, and Ewald : “ *to be exceedingly praised*, instead of being bitterly blamed,” to which κατὰ τ. κανόνα ἡμῶν is not suitable. The whole figure demands the explanation *to become large* (Matt. xxiii. 5 ; Luke i. 58), and only thus does it stand in its right relation to, and bearing on, αὐξανομ. τ. πιστ. ὑμ. Theodoret seems to have understood μεγαλ. rightly, since he explains it : περαιτέρω πορευθῆναι. Comp. Luther : “ *proceed further*,” which explains the figurative expression no doubt, but does not translate it. Osiander understands under it an actual glorifying

of the office—that its influence, greatness, and glory shall become advanced. Hofmann : that the continuation of the preaching in the far West will make him still greater, whereby he will have still more ground for boasting—a view made impossible by the fact that ἐν ὑμῖν must be joined with μεγαλ. κ.τ.λ. With all such interpretations the bold, concrete figure, which is set forth in μεγαλυνθ., is—in opposition to the connection—abandoned according to a subjective standard of taste, as if it were too strong and harsh. Erasmus in his *Annot.* (not in the *Paraphr.*) aptly says : “ *Significat se sperare futurum ut in dies crescentē fide Corinthiorum creseat ipse et major majorque fiat.*”

forth to distances indefinitely remote, he hopes to become large εἰς περισσείαν (comp. Prov. xxi. 5). Still he knows that this wide working, on which he cherishes the hope of being able to enter, will be in keeping with the line drawn for him by God—i.e. the spatial limit divinely appointed for him—and thus will be no ὑπερεκτείνειν ἑαυτ.; hence κατὰ τὸν κανόνα ἡμῶν,¹ which Beza ought not to have taken for ἐν τῷ κανόνι ἡμ. (comp. ver. 13). Further: the possibility of this wider working will not set in, *if the faith of the Corinthians does not grow*, namely, intensively, by becoming always purer, firmer, and more living than now, because Paul will not sooner be able to leave Corinth and travel onward; hence αὐξανομ. τῆς πίστεως ὑμῶν,² so that thus—and what a wholesome impulse ought this to be to them—it is the Corinthians themselves, among whom he will see himself brought to the point of being able to extend his working further; hence ἐν ὑμῖν³ μεγαλυνθ.: among you to become large in order to further abundant working. — εἰς περισσείαν] for Paul knew that he was destined to preach the gospel among all nations (Rom. i. 14, 15, and see on Rom. xv. 23, 34; Acts xix. 21); hence beyond doubt he had already at that time the intention of proceeding by way of Rome to Spain. Thus in μεγαλυνθῆναι . . . εἰς περισσείαν the whole grand feeling of his apostolic destiny finds earnest and true expression. Rückert, on the contrary, sees a touch of irony, as if Paul would say: if the Corinthians would become a church as perfect as he wishes and expects, there will thence accrue a gain also for him; he, too, will then grow with them, and become capable not only of doing in the midst of them what is necessary, but also of doing yet something more, of growing, as it were, beyond the proper stature, etc. But both κατὰ τὸν κανόνα ἡμῶν and εἰς περισσείαν are at variance with the character of irony. If Paul had wished to express himself ironically, he would have written possibly ἐν ὑμῖν μεγαλυνθῆναι ὀλίγον or the like, which would have expressed something different from what he properly meant.

Ver. 16. Infinitive without a connecting καί, and all the less therefore dependent in its turn on ἐλπίδα δὲ ἔχοντες, but rather infinitive of the aim:

¹ Rückert, at variance with the context, understands under κανὼν here the apostle's rule of not working where others had already wrought. See against this, ver. 13.

² Bengel rightly remarks on the present participle: "Paulus Corinthios neque ante tempus omittere voluit, neque alios diutius differre." Olshausen erroneously thinks that Paul was waiting for the completion of faith among the Corinthians. The apostle rather means the proportionate increase of the faith of the readers, which hitherto had not attained such a degree of development as to make it possible for him to withdraw his working from them and extend the sphere of his activity further. This delicate reference of αὐξανομ. τ. πίστ. ὑμῶν, which appeals to the whole sense of honour in the readers, and according to which Paul

makes his further working at a distance depend on their Christian progress, is missed by Hofmann, who explains αὐξανομ. κ.τ.λ. merely in the sense of coincidence in time (while faith grows). This is bound up with his incorrect joining of ἐν ὑμῖν with αὐξανομ. See the following note.

³ This ἐν ὑμῖν is not, with Luther, Castalio, Beza, Mosheim, Billroth, de Wette, Hofmann, to be joined to αὐξανομ. (whereby either ὑμῶν or ἐν ὑμῖν at any rate, even with the meaning imported into it by Hofmann: "within your own sphere," would seem very superfluous); nor yet is it to be taken as per vos (Erasmus, Grotius, Flatt), which only impairs the vividness and completeness of the figure, and in substance is already contained in αὐξανομ. τ. πιστ. ὑμ.

we hope to become exceedingly *large* among you, *in order to preach the gospel unto the lands lying beyond you*,¹ *not within the boundary-line of another to boast of what is already done*. This negative part is a side-glance at the opponents who in Corinth, which lay within the range of the line drawn for Paul, and so ἐν ἀλλοτρίῳ κανόνι, had boasted in regard to the circumstances of the church there, which they had, in fact, found already shaped before they came, consequently εἰς τὰ ἔτοιμα. Comp. Calvin : “quum Paulus militasset, illi triumphum agebant.” Beza and Billroth, also de Wette and Hofmann (who thinks all three infinitives dependent on ἐλπ. ἔχ.), take the infinitive as epexegetis of μεγαλυνθ. by adding an *id est* ; but this is precluded by the correct connection of ἐν ὑμῖν with μεγαλυνθ. For, if Paul hopes to become large *among the Corinthians*, this cannot mean the same thing as *to preach away beyond Corinth* (εἰς τὰ ὑπερέκεινα ὑμ. εὐαγγ.). No ; that μεγαλυνθ. denotes the *becoming capable* for further extended working, *the being put into a position* for it, and accordingly the aim of this is : εἰς τὰ ὑπερέκεινα ὑμῶν εὐαγγ. Ewald would make the infinitives εὐαγγ. and κανχ. dependent on κατὰ τ. κανόνα ἡμ., so that they would explain in what more precisely this rule consists ; but this is forbidden by the fact that εἰς περισσ. is not placed *before* κατὰ τ. κ. ἡμ.—The adverb ὑπερέκεινα, *ultra*, is bad Greek. See Thomas Magister, p. 336 : ἐπέκεινα ῥήτορες λέγουσι . . . ὑπερέκεινα δὲ μόνοι οἱ σύρφακες (the rabble). Comp. Bos, *Ellips.*, ed. Schaef. pp. 288, 290. — εἰς before ὑπερέκ. does stand for ἐν (Flatt and others), but comp. 1 Pet. i. 25 ; John viii. 26 ; 1 Thess. ii. 9. — οὐκ ἐν ἀλλοτρ. κανόνι] οὐκ, not μή, is here used quite according to rule (in opposition to Rückert), since the οὐκ ἐν ἀλλ. καν. is correlative to the εἰς τὰ ὑπερέκεινα ὑμῶν as contrast (Hartung, *Partikell.* II. p. 125 f.). And this correlation demands that ἐν be understood not of the object of κανχᾶσθαι (Hofmann), but locally, to which also the very notion of κανών (ver. 13) points : *within the measuring-line drawn for another, i.e.* as to substance : in the field of activity divinely destined for another. — On εἰς with κανχ., *in reference to*, comp. Arist. *Pol.* v. 10.

Ver. 17 f. The ἐν ἀλλ. καν. εἰς τὰ ἔτοιμα κανχ. was the way of the opponents, whose self-glorying was selfish ostentation. Therefore Paul now lays down the law of the *right* κανχᾶσθαι, and establishes it in a way (ver. 18), the application of which to the perversity of the opponents' boasting could not but be obvious. —δέ] leading over from the previous κανχῆσασθαι to the law of the κανχᾶσθαι. “But as regards self-glorying, the maxim applies : *Let him that glories glory* (not otherwise than) *in the Lord*,” let him have God as the object of his κανχᾶσθαι, inasmuch as it is God, by whose grace and power he has and does everything. Paul himself gives a glorious example of the ἐν κυρίῳ κανχᾶσθαι in 1 Cor. xv. 10. Comp. 2 Cor. xii. 9, 10. — As ὁ κανχ. ἐν κυρ. κανχ. is an O. T. maxim well known to the reader (Jer. ix. 23 f. ; comp. 1 Cor. i. 31), and the context contains nothing at all which would be at variance with the original reference of the ἐν κυρίῳ to God, viewed as *object* of the κανχᾶσθαι, in which this is grounded (see on Rom. ii. 17), it is

¹ “Meridiem versus et occidentem ; nam Athenis Corinthum venerat, Act. xviii. 1,” Bengel.

not to be understood of *Christ* (Erasmus, Estius, Flatt, Rückert, and others), nor is *ἐν* to be taken in the sense of *communion* (Calvin, Bengel, Osiander). Observe, moreover, what a moral difference there is between this Christian *καυχᾶσθαι ἐν θεῷ* (comp. Rom. v. 11) and that of the Jewish particularism, Rom. ii. 17. — Ver. 18. *For not he who* acts in the opposite way, *not he who*, instead of glorying *ἐν κυρίῳ*, makes *himself* the object which he *commends* to others, *is approved*, is in the position of attested Christian character, *but he, whom the Lord commends*. The latter is—and that in contrast with the opponents extolling themselves—the *practical* commendation, which God bestows on those concerned by His whole gracious aid, by the success and blessing attending their work, by their rescue from dangers, etc. In this *de facto* *θεῖα ψῆφος* (Theodoret), which is made known before the eyes of the world, they have at the same time the right *de facto* self-commendation, vi. 3 ff., without being *αὐτεπαίνετοι* (*αὐτεπαινέτους γὰρ μισεῖ ὁ θεός*, Clem. 1 Cor. 30). — Observe, further, the emphatic *ἐκεῖνος* as well as the unrestricted *δόκιμος*, the notion of which is not to be referred merely to *human* recognition (Hofmann), as in Rom. xiv. 18, where *τοῖς ἀνθρώποις* stands beside it ; comp. rather 1 Cor. xi. 19 ; Rom. xvi. 10 ; Jas. i. 12. (MM⁶)

NOTES BY AMERICAN EDITOR.

(I⁶) *The change of tone and style.* Vv. 1–18.

This change, which is obvious to every careful reader, has been explained by Stanley as due either to the reception of fresh tidings from Corinth of a relapse of fervour on the part of the church, or to a return on the part of the Apostle to his former feeling of apprehension (ii. 1). Hodge, on the other hand, says that in the previous nine chapters Paul was addressing the faithful and obedient portion of the church, while here he has in view the false teachers and their adherents, who not only made light of his authority, but corrupted the gospel, and he therefore naturally assumes a tone of authority and severity.

(J⁶) “*Every high thing that exalteth itself.*” Ver. 5.

The conflict here referred to is that between the wisdom of the world and the wisdom of God, which has continued from Paul's day to our own. Scientists and philosophers exalt their own opinions against “the knowledge of God,” which they deem foolishness. Here Paul teaches that they are not to be met with carnal weapons by turning the gospel into a philosophy. This would make it a human conflict on both sides, whereas we are to rely not upon power of argument, but on the demonstration of Spirit, setting in opposition to human reasonings the testimony of God. This is the weapon that is mighty before God and at last subdues all opposition.

(K⁶) “*Not for your destruction.*” Ver. 8.

The word here used is the same as that employed in ver. 4 of the *pulling down* of strongholds. The Revision of 1881 preserves the uniformity of terms by giving the parenthesis thus : “Which the Lord gave for building you up, and

not for casting you down." The Apostle's authority was given to him not for his own exaltation or for putting down his personal enemies, but for the building up of the church in holiness and peace.

(L⁶) "*His bodily presence is weak.*" Ver. 10.

The traditions which represent Paul as short in stature and unattractive in appearance (Renan calls him "an ugly little Jew") are, as Dr. Meyer says, of no value. The comparison of Barnabas to Jupiter and Paul to Mercury by the people of Lystra (Acts xiv. 12) implies that he was the less commanding of the two. But his whole history, his unceasing labours, his constant journeyings, his innumerable sufferings, prove that he was not physically a man of feeble constitution.

(LL⁶) *Self-measurement.* Ver. 12.

Calvin applies the whole passage to the monks of his day, who while ignorant as donkeys, were held to be learned, and if any one had even a tincture of elegant letters he spread his plumage like a peacock. Yet if one removed the cowl and examined the facts, he found nothing but emptiness. Why? The old proverb, Ignorance is bold. But particularly because they measured themselves by themselves. And since barbarism prevailed in their cloisters, it is no wonder that the one-eyed is king among the blind.

(M⁶) *Paul's province.* Ver. 14.

By this term the Revised Version renders the word given in the A. V. as *rule* (ver. 13). There is no ground for the notion that the Apostles portioned out the world amongst them with a peculiar province for each, which could not be, since their authority arose not from election or appointment to a particular place, but from their plenary knowledge, infallibility, and supernatural power, and was therefore the same everywhere and in relation to all the churches. Yet it is plain from Galatians ii. 9, that in the great divisions of Jew and Gentile, the former belonged to the original Apostles James, Peter, and John, the latter to Paul and his companions. It was also the Apostle's maxim never to make a permanent stay where the gospel had already been preached, so much so that his visit to Rome was regarded by him as taken merely on his way to Spain, which was still open to a new teacher (Rom. xv. 18-24).

(MM⁶) *The rule of true boasting.* Vv. 17, 18.

This is furnished by the Apostle in the words of Jeremiah, which he recites without naming their author. There are occasions when it is necessary for a Christian to assert his character and works and claims before men, but when these occur, the whole praise should be ascribed to God, who is the sole source of all success. This rule was binding both upon Paul and upon his opponents; the difference between them was that he observed the rule, but they did not.

CHAPTER XI.

Ver. 1. ἀνείχεσθε] Elz. : ἡνείχεσθε, following min. Chrys. Theophyl. But the former is decisively attested by B D E G L M (Σ has ἀνάσχεσθε) and many min., also Chrys. ms. Damasc. Theoph. ms. K and several min., as also Theodoret, have ἀνέχεσθε, which appears to be a corruption of the original ἀνείχεσθε, easily arising from the ἀνέχεσθε that soon follows. — τῇ ἀφροσύνῃ] So Mill, Beng. Matth. Griesb. Scholz, Reiche, following K L and many min. Copt. Chrys. Theodoret, Damasc. Oec. Theophylact, ms. But there is far more support for the reading of Lachm. Rück. and Tisch. : τι ἀφροσύνης, following B D E Σ, min. (Elz. has τιτῆς ἀφρ., following F G, min. vss. Fathers). This τι ἀφροσύνης is to be held as the original, not, however, as if Griesbach's reading had arisen only from a copyist's error of itacism (τῇ for τι, as Rinck holds, *Lucubr. crit.* p. 167, and Rück.), but on account of the relatively preponderant attestation, and because the following ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀνέχεσθέ μου most naturally suggested to the copyists to regard μου as the object of ἀνείχεσθε, to which then the genitive ἀφροσύνης was no longer suitable. Τῇ ἀφροσύνῃ had to be made out of it (*in regard to folly*), and thereupon the superfluous τι easily disappeared through the following τῇ. The reading μικρὸν τῆς ἀφροσύνης μου (F G, It. Vulg.) is explained partly from imperfect critical restoration (of the genitive), partly as an indication of the right construction. — Ver. 3. οὐτῶ] is wanting in B D* F G Σ, It. Copt. Goth. Arm. Clem. Epiph. Lucif. Gaud. ; deleted by Lachm. and Rück. An addition. — After ἀπλότῆτος B F G, Σ min. Syr. p. (with asterisk), Aeth. Copt. Goth. Boern. Pol. Aug. Beda have καὶ τῆς ἀγνότητος (so Lachm.); D E, Clar. Germ. Epiph. (once) change the order of the two parts ; Epiph. (once) has ἀγνείας instead of ἀγνότητος. After ver. 2 (ἀγνήν) ἀγνότητος was written alongside as a gloss on ἀπλότῆτος, and was already at an early date incorporated in the text, partly behind, partly before ἀπλότ. — Ver. 4. ἀνείχεσθε] The form ἡνείχεσθε (Elz.) is condemned here also by decisive evidence. Comp. ver. 1. Lachm. reads ἀνέχεσθε, but only supported by B, where it has arisen from the apparent grammatical necessity of the present. Fritzsche also, on account of this necessity, declares for the present ; but see the exegetical remarks. — Ver. 6. φανερωθέντες] Lachm. Tisch. and Rück. [also Tregelles and Westcott and Hort] read φανερώσαντες, supported by B F G Σ* 17. φανερωθέντες was explained by the gloss φανερώσαντες ἑαυτούς, as is actually the reading in M, 108** Arm., and thus the active participle came into the text, where it was the more easily retained, as it could be referred without difficulty to τὴν γνῶσιν. — Ver. 14. θαυμαστόν] B D* F G Σ, 17, 39, 67** 74, Or. have θαῦμα. So Lachm. Tisch. and Rück. The former is a gloss. — Ver. 16. The order κἀγὼ μικρ. τι κανχ. (Elz. has μικρ. τ. κἀγὼ κανχ.) has decisive attestation. — Ver. 21. ἡσθενήναμεν] Lachm. has the *perfect*, but follows only by B Σ, 80. — Ver. 27. ἐν before κόπῳ is on decisive evidence, with Lachm. Tisch. and Rück., to be deleted as an addition. — Ver. 28. ἐπισύστασίς μου] B F G Σ* : ἐπίστασις

μοι ; so Lachm. Ruck. 'Επίστασις is supported also by D E 8** 39, *al.*, which have the reading ἐπίστασις μου. Comp. also *instantia mea* in Vulg. Boern. Ambrosiast. Pel. The word ἐπισύστασις has crept in from Acts xxiv. 12, because ἐπίστασις was not understood, and μου is a hasty correction. — Ver. 32. [ὀέλων] is wanting in important witnesses, deleted by Lachm. Ruck. and Tisch. An exegetical addition.

CONTENTS.—*The apostle's self-glorying against his opponents.* (1) Introduction, vv. 1–4. (2) Theme of the self-praise, ver. 5 f. (3) Vindication of the special boast that he had preached to his readers gratuitously (vv. 7–9), a practice which he will continue to observe on account of his opponents (vv. 10–15). Then, (4) after a repeated entreaty for patience towards the folly of his self-glorying, which entreaty he accompanies with bitter remarks (vv. 16–20), he compares himself with his enemies (*a*) in general, ver. 21 ; (*b*) specially as a Jew, ver. 22 ; (*c*) as a servant of Christ, ver. 23 ff., in which latter relation he vindicates his sufferings, toils, and dangers, as things of which he will glory (vv. 23–30). Lastly, (5) after a solemn assurance that he does not lie, he begins an account of his experiences of suffering (vv. 31–33), which, however, is not continued.

Ver. 1. *Would that ye would bear from me a little bit of folly!* The connection of thought is this : after the principle just expressed in x. 18, I am indeed acting foolishly when I boast of myself ; but would that you became not angry on that account ! *Irony* ; the apostle's περιαντολογία was not, like that of his opponents, idle self-exaltation, but a vindication enjoined by the circumstances and accordant with his duty, in order to drive the refractory boasters at length quite out of the field. Flatt and Baur would insert an *also* (from me also as from mine enemies), but quite arbitrarily. — ὀφελον] see on 1 Cor. iv. 8. — ἀνείχεσθε] Hellenistic form with the simple augment (Piers. *ad Moer.* p. 176) instead of the common ἡνείχ. in the older writers (Buttmann, *Ausführl. Sprachl.* II. p. 189 f. ; Blomfield, *ad Aesch. Choeph.* 735) : The *imperfect* is not : *have borne* (Erasmus, Calvin, and others), but : *ferretis, would bear*. Comp. εἴθε with imperfect : “ubi optamus eam rerum conditionem quam non esse sentimus,” Klotz, *ad Devar.* p. 516 ; Ellendt, *Lex. Soph.* I. p. 499 ; Buttmann, *neut. Gr.* p. 185 [E. T. 215]. — μου] does not belong to ἀφροσύνης (Hofmann), so that its position standing apart and prefixed would be emphatic,—which, however, does not at all suit the enclitic form,—but, as *genitivus subjecti*, to μικρόν τι ἀφροσ., so that μικρ. τι has two genitives with it. Comp. LXX. Job vi. 26 : οὐδὲ γὰρ ὑμῶν φθέγμα ῥήματος ἀνέξομαι. See in general, Kühner, § 542. 3 ; Lobeck, *ad Aj.* 309 ; Stallbaum, *ad Plat. Rep.* p. 329 B. With the reading μικρόν τῇ ἀφροσύνῃ (see the critical remarks) it would have to be attached to ἀνείχ. (would that ye endured me a little as to folly), not to τῇ ἀφροσύνῃ, as Fritzsche, *Diss.* II. p. 53 f., contrary to the simple order of the words, prefers, and μικρόν would have to be taken either of time, or, with Reiche, of degree : *paulisper*, “non nimio fastidio.” — ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀνέχεσθέ μου] corrective : *yet this wish is not needed, ye really bear patiently with me*. The *imperative* interpretation of ἀνέχεσθε (Vulgate, Pelagius, Castalio, Beza, Calvin, Grotius, Estius, Bengel,

Hofmann), according to which Paul would proceed from wish to entreaty, would be quite tame on account of the preceding wish, and in the corrective form unsuitable. — καί] *also*, i.e. *in reality*. See Hartung, *Partikell.* I. p. 132. — μου] ἀνέχεσθε governs either the *accusative*, as in the case of μικρόν τι before (and this is the *more common* construction in Greek authors), or, as here, the *genitive* (so usually in the N. T.), which is also found in Greek authors when the object is a *thing* (Hom. *Od.* xxii. 423, and later authors, such as Herodian, viii. 5. 9, i. 17. 10), but very seldom with *persons* (Plat. *Protag.* p. 323 A), without a *participle standing alongside*, as Xen. *Anab.* ii. 2. 1; Plat. *Pol.* ii. p. 367 D, or without a *simple* participle, as Plat. *Pol.* viii. p. 564 D, *Apol.* p. 31 B; Herod. v. 89, vii. 159.

Ver. 2. Ground of the ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀνέχεσθέ μου : My jealousy for you is, in fact, a *divine* jealousy; how can you then refuse to me the ἀνέχεσθαι ! Rückert refers γάρ to ὄφελον . . . ἀφροσύνης, but in this way ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀνέχεσθέ μου is overleaped all the more violently, seeing that it is a *correction* of what goes before. Calvin (comp. Chrysostom and Bengel) : “*en cur desipiat, nam hominem zelotypia quasi transversum rapit.*” Against this may be urged the emphatic θεοῦ, in which lies the very point of the reason assigned. — ζηλω γὰρ ὑμᾶς κ.τ.λ.] As Paul, in what follows, represents himself as a marriage-friend (comp. John iii. 29) who has betrothed the bride to the bridegroom, and is now anxious that she may not let herself be led astray by another, ζηλω is to be taken in the narrowest sense as equivalent to ζηλοτυπῶ : *I am jealous concerning you* (comp. Num. v. 14; Ecclus. ix. 1), for the marriage-friend very naturally takes the bridegroom's part. The more indefinite interpretation : *I am zealous concerning you* (Flatt and others), is therefore, according to the context, *too general*, and the explanation : *vehementer amo vos* (Rosenmüller, comp. Fritzsche), is at variance with the context. — θεοῦ ζηλω] with a jealousy, *which God has*; which is no human passion, but an emotion belonging to God, which I therefore have in common with Him. Paul consequently conceives of God as likewise jealous concerning the Corinthian church (ὑμᾶς), that she might not, as the bride of Christ, suffer herself to be led astray. God appears in the O. T. as the spouse of His people, and therefore jealous regarding it (Isa. liv. 5, lxii. 5; Jer. iii. 1 ff.; Ezek. xvi. 8 ff., xxiii.; Hos. ii. 18, 19). Now, as the representative of God in the theocracy of the N. T. is *Christ*, with whom, therefore, the church appears connected, partly as spouse (see on Rom. vii. 4), partly as betrothed (with reference to the completion of the marriage at the Parousia), as here (comp. Eph. v. 25 ff.); the falling away from *Christ* must therefore be the object of *divine* jealousy, and so Paul knows *his* ζηλος, the ζηλος of the marriage-friend, as the ζηλος of *God*. θεοῦ has been taken as *genitivus auctoris* (Wolf and others, comp. Flatt, de Wette), or as : *zeal for God* (Rom. x. 2, so Calvin, Grotius, Estius, Semler, Schulz), or as : *zeal pleasing to God* (Billroth, comp. Flatt), or as : *zeal extraordinarily great* (Emmerling, so also Fritzsche; comp. Bengel : “*zelo sancto et magno*”); but all these interpretations lie beyond the necessary definite reference to what follows, in which a reason is given for the very predicate θεοῦ. (N⁶) — ἡρμοσάμην γὰρ κ.τ.λ.] *for I have betrothed you . . . but I fear*, etc., ver. 3, so that, with Lachmann,

only a comma is to be put after ver. 2. ἀρμύζειν, *adaptare*, then specially in the sense of *betroth*; see Wetstein. The more Attic form is ἀρμόττειν. See Gregor. p. 154, Schaef.; Lobeck, *ad Phryn.* p. 241. That Paul has expressed himself contrary to the Greek usage (according to which ἀρμύζεσθαι τινα means: to betroth oneself to a woman, Herod. v. 32, 47, vi. 65), is only to be said, in so far as a classical writer would certainly have used the active (Herod. ix. 108; Pind. *Pyth.* ix. 207), although in late writers the middle also occurs in the *active* sense (see the passages from Philo in Loesner, p. 320, e.g. *de Abr.* p. 364 B: γάμος ὃν ἀρμόζεται ἡδονή), and here the following ἐνὶ ἀνδρί leaves no doubt of the reference: *I have joined (i.e. according to the context, betrothed) you to one husband.* Paul regards himself as a *marriage-friend* (προυνήστωρ υἱῶν ἐγενόμην καὶ τοῦ γάμου μεσίτης, Theodoret), by whose intervention the betrothal of the Corinthians with Christ was brought to pass. Chrysostom aptly says on the figurative representation of the matter: μνηστείας γάρ ἐστι καιρὸς ὁ παρὼν καιρὸς· ὁ δὲ τῶν πασάδων ἕτερος, ὅταν λέγωσιν· ἀνέστη ὁ νυμφίος. . . Ὁ μάλιστα τούτοις (to the readers) ἔφερεν ἀξίωμα, τοῦτο τίθησιν, ἑαυτὸν μὲν ἐν χώρα τῆς προμνηστρίας, ἐκείνους δὲ ἐν τάξει τῆς νύμφης στήσας. Pelagius, Elsner, Mosheim, Emmerling wrongly hold that he conceives himself as *father* of the Corinthians; their father (but *this* figure is here quite out of place) he has, in fact, only *come to be* through their conversion to Christ (1 Cor. iv. 17; 2 Cor. xii. 14; comp. Tit. i. 4); he *had not been so already* before. Regarding the *marriage-friend* of the Jews, שׂוֹשֶׁבֶן, παρὰ νυμφίος, who not only wooed the bride for the bridegroom, but who was the constant medium between the two, and at the wedding itself was regulator of the feast, see Schöttgen, *Hor. ad Joh.* iii. 29. With the Rabbins, Moses is represented as such a marriage-friend. See Rab. Sal. *ad Exod.* xxxiv. 1, *al.* — ἐνὶ ἀνδρί] *to one husband*, to belong to no one further. — παρθένον ἀγνήν κ.τ.λ.] *Aim*, with which he had betrothed the Corinthians to a single husband: *in order to present a pure virgin to Christ* (παραστ., comp. iv. 14), namely, at the Parousia, when Christ appears as bridegroom, to fetch home the bride, Matt. xxv. 1 ff.; Eph. v. 27; Rev. xix. 7–9. The church in its entirety, as a moral person, is this virgin. On ἀγνήν, comp. Dem. 1371. 23; Plut. *Mor.* p. 268 E, 438 C; Plat. *Legg.* viii. p. 840 D. The whole emphasis is on παρθένον ἀγνήν. When this is attended to, there disappears the semblance of εἰς ἀνὴρ and ὁ Χριστός being different persons, — a semblance for which Rückert blames the apostle. Fritzsche regards τῷ Χριστῷ as apposition to ἐνὶ ἀνδρί (in which Rückert agrees with him), and encloses παραστῆσαι between two commas; but this is an unnecessary and enfeebling breaking up of the passage. Beza and Bengel connect ἐνὶ ἀνδρί with παραστ., and take τῷ Χριστῷ likewise epexegetically. But the absolute ἡρμοσάμην ὑμᾶς would in fact mean: *I have betrothed myself to you!* In order that it may not mean this, it must *necessarily* be joined to ἐνὶ ἀνδρί.

Ver. 3. The point of comparison is the *leading astray* by the *devil*, which *took place* in the case of Eve (through the serpent), and was *to be feared* in that of the Corinthians (through the false apostles, Satan's servants, ver. 15). For Paul presupposes it as well known to his readers, that *Satan* had led astray Eve by means of the serpent. To him and to them the serpent

was by no means either a *symbol* or a mystical *figure* of the *cosmical principle* (Martensen). (o⁶) Comp. Wisd. ii. 23 f. ; 4 Macc. xviii. 8 ; 1 John iii. 8 ; Rev. xii. 9, 14 f., xx. 2 ; and see on John viii. 44, and Grimm on Wisd. *l.c.* For the monstrous inventions of the later Rabbins, see Eisenmenger, *Entdecktes Judenth.* I. p. 830 ff. — Paul's mention (comp. 1 Tim. ii. 15) of *Eve* (not *Adam*) is alike in keeping with the narrative (Gen. iii.) and with the *comparison*, since the church is represented as feminine (comp. Ignat. *Eph.* interpol. 17). In Rom. v. 12 and 1 Cor. xv. 22, the connection demanded the mention of *Adam*. — ὁ ὄφις] the well-known serpent. — ἐν τῇ πανουργ. αὐτοῦ] instrumental. Comp. *Eph.* iv. 14 ; *Aq. Gen.* iii. 1 : ὁ ὄφις ἦν πανοῦργος, Ignat. *Phil.* 11 interpol. : ὁ σκολιὸς ὄφις κ.τ.λ. — φθαρῇ] *become corrupted*, not *be corrupt* (Ewald). Paul expresses himself *with tender forbearance* ; the corruption of the church by anti-Pauline doctrine (ver. 4) he sees as a *danger*. — ἀπὸ τῆς ἀπλότ. κ.τ.λ.] a pregnant phrase : lest your thoughts (comp. iii. 14, iv. 4, x. 5) *become corrupted* and led away from the *simplicity towards Christ* (εἰς X. is not equivalent to ἐν X., as the Vulgate, Beza, Calvin, and others have it). See Fritzsche, *Diss.* II. p. 63 f. ; Buttmann, *neut. Gr.* p. 277 [E. T. 322]. The ἀπλότης ἢ εἰς X. is the quality of simple, honest fidelity in the παρθένος ἀγνή, who shares her heart with no other than with her betrothed.

Ver. 4. An ironical (and therefore not conflicting with Gal. i. 18) reason assigned for that anxiety. *For if, indeed, my opponents teach and work something so entirely new among you, one would not be able to blame you for being pleased with it.* — Regarding εἰ μὲν, *if indeed*, see Hartung, *Partikell.* II. p. 414 f. ; Klotz, *ad Devar.* p. 522. — ὁ ἐρχόμενος] does not refer to ὁ ὄφις, ver. 3 (Kniewel). It might doubtless mean *the first* comer, as Emmerling and Billroth hold (Bernhardy, p. 318), comp. Gal. v. 10 ; but, since Paul manifestly has in view the conduct of the whole fraternity of opposing teachers (see immediately, ver. 5), it is rather this *totum genus* that is denoted by ὁ ἐρχόμενος, and that concretely, and in such a fashion that their emergence is vividly illustrated by reference to one definitely thought of, of whom, however, the point is left undetermined who he is : *is qui venit*. Comp. Fritzsche, *Diss.* II. p. 65 ; Kühner, *ad Xen. Anab.* v. 8. 22. The word exhibits the persons meant in the light of *outsiders*, who *come* to Corinth and there pursue their courses in opposition to the apostle. They are *intruders* (comp. iii. 1), and by the present tenses their coming and practices are denoted as still *presently* prevailing, just as this corrupting intercourse had been already going on for a considerable time. Ewald thinks here, too, of a special individual among the counter-apostles. — ἄλλον Ἰησοῦν κηρύσσει] *i.e.* so preaches of Jesus, that the Jesus now preached appears not to be the same as was previously preached,¹ consequently as if a second Jesus. Hence, to explain it more precisely, there is added : ὃν οὐκ ἐκηρύξαμεν : who was *not* the subject-matter of our preaching, of whom we have known *nothing* and preached *nothing*, therefore not the crucified Saviour (1 Cor. ii. 2)

¹ If Paul had written ἄλλον Χριστόν, the reading of F. G. Arm. Vulg., the meaning of it would be : he preaches that not Jesus,

but another is the Christ. How unsuitable this is, is self-evident.

through whom men are justified without the law, etc. ἄλλος negatives simply the identity, ἕτερος at the same time the similarity of nature : an *other Jesus . . . a different spirit*. Comp. Acts iv. 12 ; Gal. i. 6, 7 ; 1 Cor. xii. 9, xv. 40. — ἡ πνεῦμα ἕτερον κ.τ.λ.] ἡ, or, in order to describe this reformatory working from another side, *another kind of Spirit*, etc. As the false apostles might have boasted that only through *them* had the right Jesus been preached to the Corinthians,¹ they might also have added that only through *their* preaching had the readers received the true Holy Spirit, whom they had *not* before received, namely, when Paul had taught them (ὁ οὐκ ἐλάβετε). Moreover, it is decidedly clear from ἡ πνεῦμα ἕτερον κ.τ.λ. that it cannot have been (this in opposition to Beyschlag) a more exact *historical* information and communication regarding Jesus, by means of which the persons concerned attempted to supplant Paul among the Corinthians. It was by means of Judaistic false doctrines ; comp. ver. 13 ff. See also Klöpper, p. 79 f. — ὁ οὐκ ἐδέξασθε] for the *Pauline* gospel was *accepted* by the readers at their conversion : the gospel brought by the false apostles was of *another kind* (ἕτερον), which was *not* before *accepted* by them. Rückert arbitrarily says that ἐδέξασθε is equivalent to ἐλάβετε, and that the former is used only to avoid the repetition of the latter. How fine and accurate, on the other hand, is Bengel's remark : “ Verba diversa, rei apta ; non concurrat voluntas hominis in accipiendo Spiritu, ut in recipiendo evangelio.” Comp. on the distinction between the two words, Theile, *ad Jacob.* p. 68. — καλῶς ἀνείχεσθε] καλῶς, like *praeclare* in the ironical sense of *with full right*. See on Mark vii. 9 ; Fritzsche, *ad Marc.* p. 271 ff. ; *Diss.* II. p. 72 f. ; and regarding the ironical use of the adjective καλός, Stallb. *ad Rep.* p. 595 C, 607 E. According to Hofmann, καλῶς is an expression of an *earnest* approval, which, however, is *cancelled* of itself by the impossibility of the case which is put. But in the protasis the case, in fact, is just simply *put*, not put as *impossible* (comp. Gal. i. 8, 9) ; hence in the apodosis an ἀνάθεμα on the seducers, or a severe censure of those who did not withstand them, would have had its place in the mind of the apostle rather than a καλῶς ἀνείχεσθε *earnestly* meant. The imperfect ἀνείχεσθε does not, indeed, in strict logic suit κηρύσσει and λαμβάνετε in the protasis, and we should expect ἀνέχεσθε, as is actually the reading of B. But it is not on that account to be explained as if εἰ ἐκήρυσσαν κ.τ.λ. stood in the protasis (if the comer was preaching . . . ye would, etc.), as Chrysostom, Luther, Castalio, Cornelius à Lapide, and many others, including Baur, *l.c.* p. 102, explained it, which is wrong in grammar ; nor is—along with an otherwise correct view of the protasis—καλῶς ἀνείχεσθε to be taken in the *historical* sense, as has been attempted by some, as interrogatively (*have you with right tolerated it ?*), such as Heumann, by others, such as Semler,² in the form of an indignant exclamation (*you have truly well tolerated it !*), both of which meanings are logically impossible on account of the difference of tenses in the

¹ Against the interpretation that it was a spiritual, visionary Christ whom the Christian party had given out for the true one (Schenkel, de Wette, and others), see Bey-

schlag, 1865, p. 239 f.

² He is followed recently by Hilgenfeld in his *Zeitschr.* 1865, p. 261.

protasis and apodosis. No ; we have here the *transition from one construction to the other*. When Paul wrote the protasis, he meant to put ἀνέχεσθε in the apodosis ; but when he came to the apodosis, the conception of the utter *non-reality* of what was posited in the protasis as the preaching of *another Jesus*, etc., induced him to modify the expression of the apodosis in such a way, that now there is implied in it a *negatived reality*,¹ as if in the protasis there had stood εἰ ἐκήρυσσε κ.τ.λ. For there is *not another Jesus* ; comp. Gal. ii. 6. Several instances of this variation in the mode of expression are found in classical writers. See Kühner, II. p. 549 ; Klotz, *ad Devar.* p. 489. Comp. on Luke xvii. 6. The reason for the absence of ἂν in the apodosis is, that the contents of the apodosis is represented as sure and certain. See Krüger, § 65, 5 ; Stallb. *ad Plat. Sympos.* p. 190 C ; Kühner, *ad Xen. Anab.* vii. 6. 21 ; Bremi, *ad Lys. Exc.* IV. p. 438 ff.

Ver. 5. *You might well tolerate it*, Paul had just said ; but every reader who knew the apostle could not but at once of himself feel that he did not *mean* it so, that the meaning at his heart was rather : then you would be very far wrong in tolerating such novelties ; that he thus in the way of *ironical censure* makes it palpable to his readers that their complaisance towards the false apostles was the ground of his anxiety expressed in ver. 3. Hence he now by γάρ² at once *gives a reason* for the censure of that complaisance so disparaging to his own position as an apostle, which is conveyed in the ironical καλῶς ἀνείχεσθε. This γάρ does not refer therefore to ver. 1, but to what immediately precedes, in so far, namely, as it was not meant approvingly (Hofmann), but in exactly the opposite sense. Hofmann groundlessly and dogmatically replies that the reason assigned for an ironical praise must necessarily be itself ironical.³ — λογίζομαι] *censeo*, I am of opinion. Rom. ii. 3, iii. 28, viii. 18, *al.* — μηδὲν ὑστερηκέμαι] *in no respect have I remained behind*. Comp. on Matt. xix. 20. Rückert without reason adds : “*i.e. in my action.*” The μηδὲν, *in no respect* a stronger negation than the

¹ Here, too, the delicate and acute glance of Bengel saw the correct view : “*Ponit conditorem, ex parte rei impossibilem ; ideo dicit in imperfecto toleraretis ; sed pro conatu pseudapostolorum non modo possibilem, sed plane presentem ; ideo dicit in praesenti praedicat. Conf. plane Gal. i. 6 f.*” Comp. also 1 Cor. iii. 11. Rückert refines and imports a development of thought, which is arbitrarily assumed, and rests on the presupposition that there is no irony in the passage. With the same presupposition Hofmann assumes the intermingling of two thoughts, one referring to the present, the other to the past,—which would amount to a confusion of ideas without motive. This also in opposition to Klöpper, p. 84, who thinks that Paul does not wish to charge the readers with the ἀνέχεσθαι for the *immediate present*, but had been distinctly aware that they *had* tolerated, etc. In

that case we should have here a singular *forbearance* and a singular *form* of its *expression*, the former as undeserved as the latter is unlogical. There was as little need for the alleged forbearance toward the readers as in ver. 19 f.

² δέ, adopted by Lachm. on the testimony of B only, and approved by Rückert, appears after εἰ μὲν in ver. 4 as an alteration, because no reference was seen for the γάρ. With δέ there would result the quite simple course of thought : “*If indeed . . . I mean, however, etc., not as Rückert would have it, that Paul passes from the justification of the intended self-praise given in vv. 2-4 to the self-praise itself.*”

³ Without conceding this arbitrary assertion, observe, moreover, that ver. 5 also has a sufficiently ironic tinge. Comp. iv. 8, 9. See also Klöpper.

simple μή (Kühner, *ad Xen. Mem.* iv. 4. 10), excludes any restriction to some mere partial aspect of his official character. The *perfect* exhibits the state of the case as *at present continuing to subsist* (Bernhardy, p. 378): *to stand behind*. In xii. 11 the conception is different. — τῶν ὑπερλίαν ἀποστόλων] The genitive with a verb of comparison. Comp. Plat. *Pol.* 7, p. 539 E. See Matthiae, p. 836. Comp. Kypke, II. p. 265. ὑπερλίαν, *overmuch*, *supra quam valde*, is not preserved elsewhere in old Greek, but is found again, nevertheless, in Eustath. *Od.* i. p. 27, 35 : ἐστὶ γὰρ ποτε καὶ τῷ λίαν κατὰ τὴν τραγωδίαν χρᾶσθαι καλῶς, καθ' ὃ σημαϊνόμενον λέγομέν τινα ὑπερλίαν σόφον. Similarly we have ὑπεράγαν (2 Macc. viii. 35, x. 34 ; Strabo, iii. p. 147), ὑπέρευ (Kypke, *Obs.* II. p. 267), ὑπεράνω, etc., as well as generally Paul's frequent application of compounds with ὑπέρ (Fritzsche, *ad Rom.* I. p. 351). But *whom does he mean by τῶν ὑπερλίαν ἀποστόλων*? According to Chrysostom, Theodoret, Grotius, Bengel, and most of the older commentators, also Emmerling, Flatt, Schrader, Baur, Hilgenfeld, Holsten, Holtzmann (*Judenth. und Christenth.* p. 764), the actual *summos apostolos*, namely, *Peter, James, and John* (comp. Gal. ii. 9). But Paul is not contending against these, but against the *false* apostles (ver. 13); hence the expression : “*the over-great apostles*,” which is manifestly selected not μετ' ἐγκωμίων (Chrysostom), but with a certain bitterness, would be very unsuitable here (comp. on the other hand, 1 Cor. xv. 9, ix. 5) if the old apostles should be simply incidentally mentioned, because they were possibly placed high above Paul by his opponents.¹ Rightly, therefore, Richard Simon,² and others have followed Beza's suggestion (comp. Erasmus in the *Annot.*), and understood the *Judaistic anti-Pauline teachers* to be the *pseudo-apostles* (vv. 13, 22), whose inflated arrogance in exalting themselves over Paul is caricatured. Nevertheless they are not to be considered as the heads of the *Christ-party* (comp. on x. 7).

REMARK.—The reference of our passage to Peter, James, and John was supported among the earlier Protestants from polemical considerations, for the comparison in itself and the plural expression were urged against the primacy of Peter. See Calovius, *Bibl. ill.* p. 505. In defence of this primacy, it was maintained by the older Catholic writers that the equality referred to preaching and gifts, not to power and jurisdiction. See Cornelius à Lapide.

Ver. 6. A more precise explanation of this μηδὲν ὑστερηκέναι τῶν ὑπερλ. ἀποστόλων, starting from a concession, so that δέ introduces something apparently opposed. *Although, however, I am untrained in speech, yet I am not so in knowledge, but in everything we have become manifest among all in reference to you.* (P⁶) The view of Hofmann, that that concession bears on the preference of the opponents for *Apollos*, finds no confirmation in the discussion that follows. Comp. on the contrary, x. 10. — Φανερωθέντες does not apply to the γνώσις (Bengel, Zachariae, and others), for how inappropriate

¹ The immediately following εἰ δὲ καὶ ἰδιώτης τῷ λόγῳ would also be quite unsuitable, since every other apostle, at least as much as Paul, was ἰδιώτης τῷ λόγῳ.

² Alethius, Heumann, Semler, Michaelis,

Schulz, Stolz, Rosenmüller, Fritzsche, Billroth, Rückert, Olshausen, de Wette, Ewald, Osiander, Neander, Hofmann, Weiss, Beyschlag.

ver. 7 would then be ! But Paul proceeds from the γνώσις, which he has attributed to himself in opposition to the reproach of want of training in discourse, to his *having become manifest in every respect*, so that τῇ γνώσει and ἐν παντί are related to one another as species and genus.¹ It is arbitrary to supply a definite reference for φανερωθ. Rosenmüller : “tanquam verum apostolum et doctorem ;” Rückert : “as apostle and honest man”); *in every respect*, says Paul, we have become manifest as to how we are constituted ; and *what kind* of manifestation that was—its *qualitative* aspect—he leaves entirely to the judgment of his readers. Rückert (following Flatt) regards εἰ δὲ καὶ . . . γνώσει as a parenthesis, and places ἀλλ’ ἐν παντί κ.τ.λ. in connection with ver. 5, so that Paul, instead of keeping to the infinitive construction, would pass over into the participial ; but after what has been said above, this is a quite superfluous expedient, according to which, moreover, εἰ δὲ καὶ . . . γνώσει would only stand as a strangely isolated, as it were a forlorn thought, out of all connection. Olshausen, too (comp. Beza), breaks up the passage by taking the second ἀλλά as *corrective* : “Yet ye know in fact my whole conduct, why should I still describe it to you ?” And yet ἀλλ’ ἐν παντί stands in so natural relation and connection with the previous οὐ τῇ γνώσει, that it more readily occurs to us to take ἀλλά as : *but on the contrary*, than, with de Wette, to take it as co-ordinate with the first ἀλλά (introducing a second apodosis), as in 1 Cor. vi. 11. — ἰδιώτης τῷ λόγῳ] Paul therefore did not reckon a scholastically-trained eloquence (and he is thinking here specially of the Hellenic type, of which in fact Corinth was a principal seat) as among the requisites for his office.² Comp. 1 Cor. i. 17, ii. 1 ff. But his opponents (comp. x. 10) disparaged him for the want of it. Regarding ἰδιώτης, see on Acts iv. 13 ; 1 Cor. xiv. 16. — τῇ γνώσει] “quae prima dos apostoli,” Bengel ; Matt. xii. 11 ; Eph. iii. 34 ; Gal. i. 12, 15. — ἐν παντί] not : *at every time* (Emmerling, Flatt), nor *ubique* (Erasmus), but, as it always means with Paul : *in every point, in every respect*, iv. 8, vi. 4, vii. 16, viii. 7, ix. 8 ; see Bengel. Particularly frequent in this Epistle : — After φανερωθέντες, ἐσμέν is to be supplied from what goes before. The *aorist* contains the conception : have not remained hidden, but have *become manifest*. The *perfect* is different in v. 11. The device of Hofmann, that after φανερωθ, we should supply an ἐφανερώθημεν to be connected with ἐν πᾶσιν εἰς ὑμᾶς, yields a thought weak in meaning (“after that we . . . had been made manifest we have . . . been made manifest in presence of you”) and is utterly groundless. How altogether different it is at viii. 24 ! The transi-

¹ Billroth follows the reading φανερώσαντες : “If I, however, am unskilled in an artistic discourse of human wisdom, I am not so in the true, deep knowledge of Christianity ; yea rather, I have made it (the knowledge) in every point known to you in all things.” Ewald, following the same reading : “but people, who in everything (in every position) *have spoken clearly* regarding all kinds of matters (ἐν πᾶσιν) towards you.”

² How Paul, with the great eloquence to

which all his Epistles and speeches in the Book of Acts bear testimony, could. yet with truth call himself ἰδιώτης τῷ λόγῳ, Augustine, *de doct. Christ.* iv. 7, has rightly discerned : “Sicut apostolum praecepta eloquentiae secutum fuisse non dicimus : ita quod ejus sapientiam secuta sit eloquentia, non negamus.” Comp. also how Xenophon (*de venat.* 14, 3) designates and describes himself as *idiotes*, in contradistinction to the *sophists*.

tion to the plural form inclusive of others (by which Paul means himself and his fellow-teachers) cannot surprise any one, since often in his case the purely personal consciousness and that of fellowship in a common office present themselves side by side. Comp. i. 23 f., v. 11 ; 1 Thess. iii. 4 f. ; Philem. 7 f., *al.* — ἐν πᾶσιν] being separated from ἐν παντί cannot (as in Phil. iv. 2) be taken as *neuter* (in all things, Billroth, Neander ; in all possible points, Hofmann : ἐν πᾶσιν οἷς ποιοῦμεν κ. λέγομεν, Theophylact), but only as *masculine*: among all we have been made manifest in reference to you, that is, among all (i.e. *coram omnibus*) there has been clearly displayed, and has remained unknown to none, there lation in which we stand to you ; every one has become aware what we are to you. Comp. Erasmus (“quales simus erga vos”).

Ver. 7. That Paul meant by his ἐν παντί φανερωθ. an *advantageous* manifestation, was obvious of itself ; comp. v. 11. Hence, in order now to make good a distinctive peculiar point of his φανέρωσις, he continues with a question of bitter pain, such as the sense of being maliciously misunderstood brought to his lips : *Or have I committed sin—abasing myself in order that ye might be exalted—that I gratuitously preached to you the gospel of God?* No doubt the opponents had turned this noble sacrifice on his part, by way of reproach, into un-apostolic meanness. — ἐμavτὸν ταπεινῶν] namely, by my renouncing, in order to teach gratuitously, my apostolic ἐξουσία, 1 Cor. ix., and contenting myself with very scanty and mean support (comp. Acts xviii. 3, xx. 34). Chrysostom and others exaggerate it : ἐν στενοχωρίᾳ διήγαγον, for καὶ ὑστερηθεῖς, ver. 8, is only a temporary increased degree of the ταπεινώσις. — ἵνα ὑμεῖς ὑψωθῇτε] viz. from the lowness of the dark and lost pre-Christian condition through conversion, instruction, and pastoral care to the height of the Christian salvation. It is much too vague to take it of *prosperity in general* (Schulz, Rosenmüller, Flatt) ; and when Zachariae explains it : “in order to prefer you to other churches,” or when others think of the *riches* not lessened by the gratuitous preaching (Mosheim, Heumann, Morus, Emmerling), they quite fail to see the apostle's delicate way of significantly varying the relations. Comp. viii. 9. Chrysostom already saw the right meaning : μᾶλλον ὁκοδομοῦντο καὶ οὐκ ἐσκανδαλίζοντο. — ὅτι] *that*, belongs to ἁμαρτ. ἐποίησα (to which ἐμavτ. ταπεινῶν is an accompanying modal definition), inserted for the sake of disclosing the contrast of the case as it stood to the question. Ὅτι may also be taken as an exegesis of ἐμavτ. ταπειν. κ.τ.λ., so that already with the latter the committing of sin would be described as regards its contents ; comp. Acts xxi. 13 ; Mark xi. 5 (so Luther, Beza, and many others, also Osiander). But our view interweaves more skilfully into one the question with its contradictory contents. — δωρεάν] has the emphasis. — τοῦ θεοῦ] Genitivus auctoris. Note the juxtaposition : δωρεὰν τὸ τοῦ θεοῦ εὐαγγ. : *gratuitously* the gospel of God (“pretiosissimum,” Bengel). (Q⁶)

Ver. 8. Further information as to the previous δωρεὰν κ.τ.λ. — ἐσύλησα] *I have stripped*, plundered, a *hyperbolic*, impassioned expression, as is at once shown by λαβὼν ὀψώνιον after it. The ungrateful ones are to be made aware, in a way to put them thoroughly to shame, of the forbearance shown to them. — The ἄλλαι ἐκκλησίαι meant were beyond doubt *Macedonian*. Comp.

ver. 9. — λαβὼν κ.τ.λ.] contemporaneous with ἐσύλησα, and indicating the manner in which it was done. — ὀψώνιον] *pay* (see on Rom. vi. 23), *i.e.* payment for my official labour. — πρὸς τὴν ὑμῶν διακονίαν] Aim of the ἄλλας ἐκκλ. ἐσύλησα λαβὼν ὀψ., so that the emphatic ὑμῶν corresponds to the emphatic ἄλλας. Paul had therefore destined the pay taken from *other* churches to the purpose of rendering (gratuitously) his official service to the *Corinthians*, to whom he travelled from Macedonia (Acts xvii. 13 f., xviii. 1) in order to preach to them the gospel. — καὶ παρὼν κ.τ.λ.] *and during my presence with you I have, even when want had set in with me, burdened no one.* He thus brought with him to Corinth the money received from other churches, and subsisted on it (earning more, withal, by working with his hands) ; and when, during his residence there, this provision was gradually exhausted, so that even want set in (καὶ ὑστερηθεὶς), he nevertheless importuned no one, but (ver. 9) continued to help himself on by Macedonian pecuniary aid (in addition to the earnings of his handicraft). Comp. on Phil. iv. 15. Rückert thinks that Paul only sought to relieve his want by the manual labour entered on with Aquila, when the money brought with him from Corinth had been exhausted and new contributions had not yet arrived. But, according to Acts xviii. 3, his working at a handicraft—*of which, moreover, he makes no mention in this passage*—is to be conceived as continuing from the beginning of his residence at Corinth ; how conceivable, nevertheless, is it that, occupied as he was so greatly with other matters, he could not earn his *whole* livelihood, but still stood in need of *supplies* ! On πρὸς ὑμᾶς, which is not to be taken “after my coming to you” (Hofmann), comp. 1 Cor. xvi. 6 ; Matt. xiii. 56. — κατενάρκησα] Hesychius : ἐβάρυννα, *I have lain as a burden on no one.* It is to be derived from νάρκη, *paralysis, debility, torpidity* ; thence ναρκάω, *torpeo*, Il. viii. 328 ; Plat. Men. p. 80 A B C ; LXX. Gen. xxxii. 32 ; Job xxxiii. 19 ; hence καταναρκᾶν τινος : *to press down heavily and stiffly on any one* (on the genitive, see Matthiae, p. 860). Except in Hippocrates, p. 816 C, 1194 H, in the passive (*to be stiffened*), the word does not occur elsewhere in Greek ; and by Jerome, *Aglas*. 10, it is declared to be a Cilician expression equivalent to *nōn gravari vos*. Vulgate : “nulli onerosus fui.” Another explanation, quoted in addition to the above by Theophylact (comp. Oecumenius) : “*I have not become indolent in my office*” (so Beza, who takes κατὰ . . . οὐδενός, *cum cujusquam incommodo*), would be at variance with the context. See ver. 9. Comp. also xii. 13, 14. Besides, this sense would not be demonstrable for καταναρκ. but for ἀποναρκ. (Plutarch, *Edue.* p. 8 F).

Ver. 9. τὸ γὰρ ὑστέρημα down to Μακεδονίας is not, with Griesbach, Lachmann, and others, to be made parenthetical,¹ since καὶ ἐν παντὶ κ.τ.λ. is structurally and logically (as consequence) connected with it : *for what was wanting to me the brethren (known to you) supplied, after they had come from Macedonia, and, etc.* — προσανεπλήρωσαν] *addendo suppleverunt* (comp. ix. 12). But we are not, with Grotius (who in ver. 8 and here thinks of the means for supporting the poor) and Bengel, to seek the reference of πρὸς in the

¹ So also Ewald, who takes ver. 8 and ver. 9 still as a continuation of the question in ver. 7.

addition to the *earnings of his labour*, for of this the whole context contains nothing ; but the brethren added the support brought by them to the apostle's still very small provision, and so supplemented his ὑστέρημα. This aid is later than that mentioned in Phil. iv. 15 (see *in loc.*) : the names of the brethren (were they Silas and Timothy ? Acts xviii. 5) are unknown to us. — καὶ ἐν παντὶ κ.τ.λ.] *and in every point* (comp. ver. 6) *I have kept and will keep myself non-burdensome to you* ; I have occasioned you no burden in mine own person, and will occasion you none in the future (“*tantum abest, ut poeniteat*,” Bengel). — ἀβαρέως only here in the N. T., but see Arist. *de coel.* 4 ; Chrysipp. in Plut. *Mor.* p. 1053 E ; Luc. *D. M.* x. 5.

Ver. 10. Not in form an oath, but a very solemn assurance of the καὶ τηρήσω : *there is truth of Christ in me, that*, etc. That is to say : *By the indwelling truth of Christ in me I assure you that*, etc. The apostle is certain that as generally Christ lives in him (Gal. ii. 20) Christ's mind is in him (see on 1 Cor. ii. 16), Christ's heart beats in him (Phil. i. 8), Christ speaks in him (xiii. 3), all, namely, through the Spirit of Christ, which dwells in him (Rom. viii. 9 ff.) ; so, in particular, also *truth* of Christ is in him, and therefore all untruthfulness, lying, hypocrisy, etc., must be as foreign to him as to Christ Himself, who bears sway in him. The ὅτι is the simple *that*, dependent on the idea of *assurance*, which lies at the bottom of the clause ἐστὶν ἀλήθ. X. ἐν ἐμοί, and has its specific expression in this clause. Comp. ζῶ ἐγὼ, ὅτι, Rom. xiv. 11. See Fritzsche, *ad Rom.* II. p. 242 f. Rückert's view is more far-fetched : that ὅτι κ.τ.λ. is the subject, of which Paul asserts that it is ἀλήθεια Χριστοῦ in him, *i.e.* what he says is a proposition, which just as certainly contains truth, as if Christ Himself said it. Olshausen attenuates the sense at variance with its literal tenor into : “*as true as I am a Christian.*” The thought is really the same in substance as that in Rom. ix. 1 : ἀλήθειαν λέγω ἐν Χριστῷ, οὐ ψεύδομαι, but the form of the conception is different. — ἡ καύχησις αὕτη οὐ φραγ. εἰς ἐμέ] *this self-boasting will not be stopped in reference to me.* The *gloriatio* spoken of, namely as to preaching gratuitously, is *personified* ; its mouth is not, as to what concerns the apostle, to be stopped, so that it must keep silence. Hofmann, not appreciating this personification, takes offence at the fact that the καύχησις is supposed to have a *mouth*, while Rückert resorts to an odd artificial interpretation of φραγ. εἰς ἐμέ (*will not be cooped up in me*). Just because the καυχᾶσθαι is an action of the *mouth*, the *personified* καύχησις has a *mouth* which can be *stopped*. Comp. Theodoret. — φραγήσεται] Comp. Rom. iii. 19 ; Heb. xi. 33 ; LXX. Ps. cvii. 42 ; Job v. 16 ; 2 Macc. xiv. 36 ; Wetstein, *ad Rom. l.c.* ; Jacobs, *ad Anthol.* XII. p. 297. It cannot surprise us that τὸ στόμα is not expressly subjoined, since this is obvious of itself, seeing that the καύχησις is conceived as *speaking*. There is nothing in the context to justify the derivation of the expression from the damming up of running water, as Chrysostom and Theophylact, also Luther (see his gloss), and again Hofmann take it. There is just as little ground for de Wette's suggestion, that φραγήσεται is meant of *hedging in a way* (Hos. ii. 6). — εἰς ἐμέ] For, if Paul should so conduct himself that he could no longer boast of preaching gratuitously, the mouth of this καύχησις would, *in reference to him*, be stopped. In this εἰς ἐμέ,

as concerns me, there is implied a tacit comparison with others, who conducted themselves differently, and in regard to whom, therefore, the mouth of καύχησις αὐτή would be stopped. — ἐν τοῖς κλίμασι τῆς Ἀχ.] is more weighty, and at the same time more tenderly forbearing, than the direct ἐν ὑμῖν, which would be πληκτικώτερον (Chrysostom).

Ver. 11. *Negative specification of the reason* for his continuing to preach gratuitously in Achaia. — How easily, since he had accepted something from the poorer Macedonians, might his conduct appear or be represented to the Corinthians as the result of a cold, disdainful, distrustful disposition towards them ! Love willingly accepts from the beloved one what is due to it. — ὁ θεὸς οἶδεν] namely, that the reason is not want of love to you. — Observe the lively *interrogative* form (Dissen, *ad Dem. de cor.* pp. 186, 347).

Ver. 12.¹ *Positive specification of the reason*, after brief repetition of the matter which calls for it (ὁ δὲ ποιῶ, καὶ ποιήσω). — Since Paul, in accordance with ver. 10, wishes to specify the aim inducing *the future continuance* of his conduct, καὶ ποιήσω must be *apodosis* (comp. Erasmus, *Annot.*, Beza, Bengel, Lachmann, Tischendorf), and must not be attached to the protasis, so as to make it necessary to supply before ἵνα a διὰ τοῦτο ποιῶ (Erasmus, *Paraphr.*, Luther, Castalio, Emmerling), or τοῦτο ποιῶ κ. ποιήσω (Rückert, but undecidedly), or simply γίνεται (Osiander, Ewald). — ἵνα ἐκκόψω κ.τ.λ.] *in order that I may cut off the opportunity of those, who wish* (exoptant, Beza) *opportunity*, namely, to degrade and to slander me. Τὴν ἀφορμὴν, having the article, denotes the definite occasion, arising from the subject in question, for bringing the apostle into evil repute. Had he caused himself to be remunerated by the Corinthians, his enemies, who in general were looking out for opportunity (ἀφορμ. without the article), would have taken thence *the opportunity* of slandering him as selfish and greedy ; this was *their ἀφορμή*, which he wished to cut off (ἀναιρεῖν, Chrysostom) by his gratuitous working. Others understand by τὴν ἀφορμὴν the occasion of *exalting and magnifying themselves above him* (Calvin, Grotius, Flatt). But according to this, we should have to assume that the false apostles had taken *no* pay, on which point, after the precedent of Chrysostom, Theophylact, Calvin, Grotius, Billroth, and others, Rückert especially insists. This assumption, however, which Neander also supports (comp. against it, Beza), has against it *à priori* the fact that Paul lays so earnest stress on his gratuitous preaching—which would not be appropriate to his apologetico-polemic train of argument, if on this point he had stood on the same footing with his opponents. Further, xi. 20 and 1 Cor. ix. 12 are expressly opposed to it ; and the objection of Rückert, that the apostle's testimony to the baseness of his opponents loses much of its force owing to his passionate temperament, is an exaggerated opinion, to which we can concede only this much, that his testimony regarding his opponents is strongly expressed (comp. ver. 20), but not that it contains anything untrue. If they had worked against him from honest prejudice, it would have been at once indiscreet and un-Christian in him to work against them. Rückert's *further* objection, that the

¹ See regarding ver. 12, Düsterdieck in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1865, p. 517 ff.

adversaries, if they had taken payment where Paul took none, would have coupled folly with selfishness, is unfounded, seeing that in fact, even with that recommendation in which Paul had the advantage of them by his unpaid teaching, very many other ways were left to them of exalting themselves and of lowering his repute, and hence they might be all the more prudent and cunning. Comp. on ver. 6. — *ἵνα ἐν ᾧ καυχῶνται κ.τ.λ.*] may be parallel to the previous clause of purpose (Düsterdieck). Yet it is more in keeping with the logical relation—that here something positive, and previously only something negative, is asserted as intended—and thereby with the climactic course of the passage, to assume that *ἵνα ἐν ᾧ καυχ.* κ.τ.λ. is the aim of *ἐκκόψω τὴν ἀφορμὴν τ. θ. ἀφ.*, and thus the final aim of the *ὁ δὲ ποιῶ, καὶ ποιήσω* in regard to the opponents: *in order that they, in the point of which they boast, may be found even as we.* This is what I purpose to bring about among them. If, namely, the enemies did not find in Paul the opportunity of disparaging him as selfish, now there was to be given to them withal the necessity (according to his purpose) of showing themselves to be just such as Paul¹ in that, in which they boasted, *i.e.* according to the context, in the point of *unselfishness*. Hitherto, forsooth, the credit of unselfishness, which they assigned to themselves, was idle ostentation, see ver. 20. De Wette makes objection, on the other hand, that they could not have boasted of unselfishness, if they had shown themselves selfish. But this was the very point of his enemies' *untruthfulness* (ver. 13, comp. v. 12), that they vaingloriously displayed the *semblance* of unselfishness, while in fact they knew how to enrich themselves by the Christians. Theodoret aptly says: *ἔδειξε δὲ αὐτοὺς λόγῳ κομπάζοντας, λάθρα δὲ χρηματιζομένους.* Düsterdieck, too, can find no ground in the context for saying either that the opponents had reproached the apostle with selfishness, or had given themselves out for unselfish. But the former is not implied in our explanation (they only sought the *occasion* for that charge), while the latter is sufficiently implied in ver. 20. The expositors who consider the opponents as labouring *gratuitously* understand *ἐν ᾧ καυχῶνται* of this unpaid working, of which they had boasted, so that Paul in this view would say: *in order that they, in this point of which they boast, may be found not better than we.* See Oecumenius, Erasmus, Calvin, comp. Billroth and Rückert; Billroth and others (comp. Düsterdieck above) taking withal the second *ἵνα* as parallel to the first, which Rückert also admits. But against the hypothesis that the opponents had taught gratuitously, see above. And the *not better than we* arbitrarily changes the positive expression *καθὼς ἡμεῖς* into the negative. Lastly, this explanation stands in no logical connection with what follows. See on ver. 13. Following Augustine, *de serm. Dom. in monte*, ii. 16, Cajetan and Estius regard *ἵνα . . . ἡμεῖς* as an exposition of *ἀφορμὴν*: *occasion, in order to*

¹ Beza well gives the substantial meaning: "Isti quidem omnem mei calumniandi occasionem captant, expectantes dum poeniteat me juri meo renuntiantem in prae-dicando evangelio ex manuum mearum labore victitare. At ego nunquam patiar

hanc laudem (qua ipsos refello) mihi in Achaiae ecclesiis praeripi. Imo in hoc instituto pergam, ut et ipsos ad exemplum meum imitandum provocem, nedum ut quam captant occasionem inveniant."

be found as we, and ἐν ᾧ καυχ. as parenthetical : *in quo, sc. in eo quod est inveniri sicut et nos, gloriantur.* Comp. also Bengel. But the opponents did not, in fact, boast of being *like* Paul, but of being *more* than he was (ver. 5), and wished to hold him or to have him held as not at all a true apostle, ver. 4. This also in opposition to Hofmann, who, attaching the second ἵνα to ἀφορμήν, and referring ¹ ἐν ᾧ καυχῶνται to the apostleship of which the opponents boasted, finds Paul's meaning to be this : *maintaining in its integrity the gratuitous character of his working, he takes away from those, who would fain find ways and means of making their pretended apostleship appear equal to his genuine one, the possibility of effecting their purpose.* But in the connection of the text, ἐν ᾧ καυχῶνται on the one side and καθὼς καὶ ἡμεῖς on the other can only denote one and the same quality, namely, the *unselfishness*, of which the opponents untruly boasted, while Paul had it in truth and verified it. Olshausen has been led farthest astray by taking the second ἵνα as the wish of the opponents ; he imagines that they had been annoyed at Paul's occupying a position of strictness which put them so much to shame, and hence they had wished to bring him away from it, in order that he might have no advantage, but that he should be found even as they. And the ἐν ᾧ καυχ. is to be taken, as if they had put forward the authority to take money as an object of glorying, as an apostolic prerogative (1 Cor. ix. 7 ff.) ; so that the whole passage has therefore the *ironical* meaning : "*Much as they are opposed to me, they still wish an opportunity of letting me take a share of their credit, that I may allow myself to be supported as an apostle by the churches ; but with this they wish only to hide their shame and rob me of my true credit : in this they shall not succeed !*" But that the opponents had put forward the warrant to take money as an apostolic prerogative, is not to be inferred from 1 Cor. ix. 7 ff., where Paul, in fact, speaks only of the *right* of the teacher to take pay. Further, there is no ground in the context for the assumed reference of ἐν ᾧ καυχ. ; and lastly, in keeping with the alleged ironical meaning, Paul must have written : εὐρεθῶμεν καθὼς καὶ αὐτοί, which Olshausen doubtless felt himself, when he wrote : "*in order that he might have no advantage, but that he should be found such as they.*" — On ἐκκόπτειν, in the *ethical* sense of *bringing to nought*, comp. LXX. Job xix. 10 ; 4 Macc. iii. 2 ff. ; Plat. Charm. p. 155 C ; Polyb. xx. 6. 2. The opposite : παρέχειν ἀφορμήν (Bähr, *ad Pyrrh.* p. 237). — On the double ἵνα, the second introducing the aim of the first clause of aim, comp. Eph. v. 27 ; John i. 7. Hofmann, without reason, desires ὅπως in place of the second ἵνα.

¹ De Wette and Düsterdieck also refer ἐν ᾧ καυχῶνται to the *apostolic working and dignity*. According to the latter, the meaning would be : *in order that they, as regards unselfishness, may let themselves be found just such as I, the apostle vilified by them, and may in this way show what is the worth of their boastful claim to apostolic dignity.* Even this clear interpretation does not remove the difficulty that, as the καύχησις of Paul con-

cerned the *gratuitous nature of his labouring* (ver. 10, comp. 1 Cor. ix. 15), so also the καυχᾶσθαι ascribed in the immediate context to the opponents, and pointing back by καθὼς καὶ ἡμεῖς to the apostle's conduct (which was the subject-matter of his boasting), requires no other *object*, nay, when we strictly adhere to the immediate connection, *admits* of no other.

Ver. 13. Justification of the aforesaid *ἵνα ἐν ᾧ καυχῶνται, εὐρεθ. καθὼς κ. ἡμεῖς*. "Not without ground do I intend that they shall, in that of which they boast, be found to be as we ; for the part, which these men play, is lying and deceit." — Those who take *καθὼς κ. ἡμεῖς* in ver. 12 : *not better than we*, must forcibly procure a connection by arbitrarily supplying something ; as *e.g.* Rückert : that in the heart of the apostle *not better than we* had the meaning : *but rather worse*, and that this is now illustrated. Hofmann, in consequence of his view of *ἵνα ἐν ᾧ καυχ.* κ.τ.λ. ver. 12, interpolates the thought : "*for the rest*" they have understood how to demean themselves as Christ's messengers. — *οἱ γὰρ τοιοῦτοι κ.τ.λ.] for people of that kind are false apostles, etc.*, so that *ψευδαπόστολοι* is the *predicate*.¹ So also de Wette and Ewald. Usually, after the Vulgate (also Flatt, Billroth, Rückert, Hofmann), *ψευδαπόστολοι* is made the *subject* : "for such false apostles are," etc. But it should, in fact, be rather put : "for the false apostles *of that kind* (in distinction from *other* false apostles, comp. xii. 3 ; Soph. *O. R.* 674 ; Polyb. viii. 2, 5, xvi. 11, 2) are," etc.,—which would be quite appropriate. Besides, the *ψευδαπόστολοι*, disclosing entirely at length the character of the enemies, would lose its emphasis. On the contemptuous sense of *τοιοῦτος*, comp. Ellendt, *Lex. Soph.* II. p. 843. — *ἐργάται δόλιοι*] comp. Phil. iii. 2. They were *workers*, in so far certainly as they by teaching and other activity were at work in the church ; but they were *deceitful workers* (dealt in *δολίαις βουλαῖς*, Eur. *Med.* 413, *δολίοις ἐπέεσσιν*, Hom. ix. 282, and *δολίαις τέχναισι*, Pind. *Nem.* iv. 93), since they wished only to appear to further the true Christian salvation of the church, while at bottom they pursued their own selfish and passionate aims (ver. 20). For the opposite of an *ἐργάτης δόλιος*, see 2 Tim. ii. 15. — *μετασχηματιζ. εἰς ἀποστ. Χ.] transforming themselves into apostles of Christ*. Their essential form is not that of apostles of Christ, for they are servants of Satan ; in order to appear as the former, they thus assume another form than they really have, present themselves otherwise than they really are. In working against Paul in doctrine and act, they hypocritically assumed the mask of apostle, though they were the opposite of a true apostle (Gal. i. 1 ; Rom. xv. 18 ff. ; 2 Cor. xii. 12).

Vv. 14, 15. And that is quite natural ! — *καὶ οὐ θαῦμα*] *neque res admiranda est*. Comp. Plat. *Pol.* vi. p. 498 D ; *Epin.* p. 988 D ; Pind. *Nem.* x. 95, *Pyth.* i. 50 ; Eur. *Hipp.* 439 ; Soph. *Oed. R.* 1132, *Phil.* 408 ; Pflugk, *ad Eur. Hec.* 976. — What follows is an *argumentum a majori ad minus*. — *αὐτός*] *ipse Satanas*, their Lord and master. Comp. afterwards *οἱ διάκονοι αὐτοῦ*. See Hermann, *ad Viger.* p. 733. — *εἰς ἄγγελον φῶτός*] *into an angel of light*. As the nature of God (1 John i. 5 ; Rev. xxi. 23, 24), and His dwelling-place (1 Tim. vi. 16 ; 1 John i. 7) is light, a glory of light, a *δόξα* beaming with light, which corresponds to the most perfect holy purity, so

¹ Bengel says aptly : "Haec jam pars praedicati, antitheton, ver. 5. *Nunc tandem scapham scapham dicit.*" On the idea of *ψευδαπόστολοι*, Erasmus rightly remarks : "*Apostolus enim ejus agit negotium a quo missus est, isti suis commodis serviunt.*"

Without doubt the people maintained for themselves their claim with equal, nay, with better right than Paul, to the name of *apostle*, which they probably conceded to Paul only in the wider sense (Acts xiv. 4, 14 ; 1 Cor. xv. 7).

also His servants, *the good angels*, are *natures of light* with bodies of light (1 Cor. xv. 40) ; hence, where they appear, light beams forth from them (Matt. xxviii. 3, *al.*; Acts xii. 7, *al.*; see Hahn, *Theol. d. N. T.* I. p. 274 f.; Weiss, *bibl. Theol.* p. 460). Regarding Satan, on the other hand, comp. Eph. vi. 12 ; Acts xxvi. 18 ; Col. i. 13. He is ὁ κληρονόμος τοῦ σκότους, Ev. Nic. 20. — There is no trace in the narratives concerned to justify the assumption¹ that ver. 15 points to the *fall of man* (Bengel, Semler, Hengstenberg, *Christol.* I. p. 11), or even to *the temptation of Christ*, Matt. iv. 8, in which the devil appeared as the angel to whom God had entrusted the rule of Palestine (Michaelis) ; but, at any rate, it is the apostle's thought, and is also presupposed as known to the readers, that devilish temptations in angelic form assail man. In the O. T. this idea is not found ; it recurs later, however, in the Rabbins, who, with an eccentric application of the thought, maintained that the *angel* who wrestled with Jacob (Gen. xxxii. 34 ; Hos. xii. 4, 5) was the *devil*. See Eisenmenger, *entdeckt. Judenth.* I. p. 845. For conceptions regarding the demons analogous to our passage from Porphyry and Jamblichus, see Grotius and Elsner, *Obs.* p. 160. (R⁶)

Ver. 15. It is *not a great matter, therefore*, not strange and extraordinary, *if*, etc. Comp. 1 Cor. ix. 11 ; Plato, *Hipp. maj.* p. 287 A, *Menex.* p. 235 D ; Herod. vii. 38. — *καὶ* if, as he does himself, *his servants also* transform themselves, namely, as servants of righteousness, *i.e.* as people who are appointed for, and active in, furthering the righteousness by faith. Comp. on iii. 9. The δικαιοσύνη, the opposite of ἀνομία, but in a specifically Christian and especially Pauline sense (comp. on vi. 14) as the condition of the kingdom of God, is naturally that which Satan and his servants seek to counteract. When the latter, however, demean themselves as ἀπόστολοι Χριστοῦ, the δικαιοσύνη, which they pretend to serve, must have the *semblance* of the righteousness *of faith*, although it is not so in reality. This view is therefore not “*out of the way*” (Klöpffer, p. 90), but contextual ; and the δικαιοσύνη cannot be the righteousness of the *law*, the preaching of which is not the mark of the ἀπόστολοι Χριστοῦ. As to ὡς (*transform themselves and become as*), comp. on Rom. ix. 29. — ὃν τὸ τέλος κ.τ.λ.] of *whom*—the servants of Satan—the *end, final fate, will be in accordance with their works*. (S⁶) Comp. Phil. iii. 19 ; Rom. vi. 21 ; 1 Pet. iv. 17. “Quacunque specie se nunc efferant, detrahatur tandem schema,” Bengel.

Ver. 16. *I repeat it : let no one hold me for irrational ; but if not, receive me at least as one irrational* (do not reject me), *in order that I too* (like my opponents) *may boast a little*. — Thus Paul, after having ended the outpouring of his heart begun in ver. 7 regarding his gratuitous labours, and after the warning characterization of his opponents thereby occasioned (vv. 13–15), now turns back to what he had said in ver. 1, in order to begin a new self-comparison with his enemies, which he, however, merely *introduces*—and that once more with irony, at first calm, then growing bitter—down to ver. 21,

¹ The *present* would not be against it. See Bengel : “Solet se transformare ; fecit jam in paradiso.” According to Ewald, we are to think of a narrative, which was known

then but is not preserved in our present O. T., to which Paul alludes, or of a narrative similar to that in Matt. iv. 1–11.

and only *really* begins with ἐν ᾧ δ' ἂν τις τολμᾷ κ.τ.λ. at ver. 21. — *That, which* is by πάλιν λέγω designated as already said once (ver. 1), is μή τις με δόξῃ ἄφρ. εἶναι and εἰ δὲ μή γε . . . καυχῆσθωμαι, both together, not the latter alone (Hofmann). The former, namely, lay *implicite* in the ironical character of ver. 1, and the latter *explicite* in the words of that verse. (T⁶) — εἰ δὲ μή γε] *sed nisi quidem*. Regarding the legitimacy of the γε in Greek (Plato, *Pol.* iv. p. 425 E), see Bremi, *ad Aesch. de fals. leg.* 47 ; Klotz, *ad Devar.* p. 527 ; Dindorf, *ad Dem.* I. p. v. f. praef. After *negative* clauses εἰ δὲ μή follows even in classical writers (Thuc. i. 28. 1, 131. 1 ; Xen. *Anab.* iv. 3. 6, vii. 1. 8), although we should expect εἰ δέ. But εἰ δὲ μή presupposes in the author the conception of a positive form of what is negatively expressed. Here something like this : I wish that no one should hold me as foolish ; if, however, you do not grant what I wish, etc. See in general, Heindorf, *ad Plat. Parm.* p. 208 ; Buttmann, *ad Plat. Crit.* p. 106 ; Hartung, *Partik.* II. p. 213 ; and in reference to the N. T., Fritzsche, *ad Matth.* p. 554 f. — κἂν] *certe*, is to be explained *elliptically* : δέξασθέ με, καὶ ἐὰν ὡς ἄφρονα δέξησθέ με. Comp. Mark vi. 56 ; Acts v. 15. See Wüstemann, *ad Theocr.* xxiii. 35 ; Jacobs, *ad Anthol.* XI. p. 316 ; Winer, p. 543 [E. T. 729]. — ὡς ἄφρονα] *in the quality of one irrational*, as people give an indulgent hearing to such a one. — μικρόν τι] *accusative* as in ver. 1 : *aliquantulum*, may deal in a little bit of boasting.

Ver. 17. More precise information as to the κἂν ὡς ἄφρονα. — ὁ λαλῶ] namely, in the boastful speech now introduced and regarded thereby as already begun. — κατὰ κύριον] *according to the Lord* (comp. Rom. xv. 5, viii. 27), *i.e.* so that I am determined in this case by the guiding impulse of Christ. A speaking according to Christ cannot be boasting ; Matt. xi. 29 ; Luke xvii. 10. Now as Paul knew that the κατὰ κύριον λαλεῖν was brought about by the πνεῦμα working in him (comp. 1 Cor. vii. 10, xxv. 40), οὐ λαλῶ κατὰ κύριον certainly denies the *theopneustic* character of the utterance in the stricter sense, (U⁶) without, however, the apostle laying aside the consciousness of the Spirit's guidance, under which he, for his purpose, allows the human emotion temporarily to speak. It is similar when he expresses *his own opinion*, while yet he is conscious withal of having the Spirit (1 Cor. vii. 12, 25, 40). Regarding the *express remark*, that he does not speak κατὰ κύριον κ.τ.λ., Bengel aptly says : “quin etiam hunc locum et propriam huic loco exceptionem sic perscripsit *ex regula decori divini*, a Domino instructus.” — ἀλλ' ὡς ἐν ἀφροσύνῃ] *but as one speaks in the state of irrationality*. — ἐν ταύτ. τ. ὑποστ. τ. κ.] belongs to οὐ λαλῶ κατὰ κύριον, ἀλλ' ὡς ἐν ἀφροσ. taken together : *not according to the Lord, but as a fool do I speak it, with this confidence of boasting*. ὑπόστασις is here interpreted as differently as in ix. 4. According to Chrysostom, Rückert, Ewald, Hofmann, and many others : in this *subject-matter of boasting* (comp. Luther, Billroth, and de Wette : “since it has once come to boasting”). But what little meaning this would have ! and how scant justice is thus done to the ταύτῃ prefixed so emphatically (with *this* so great confidence) ! The boasting is indeed not yet actually begun (as de Wette objects), but the apostle is already occupied with it in thought ; comp. previously λαλῶ. According to Hofmann, ἐν ταύτ. τ. ὑπ. τ. κ. is to be attached to the following protasis ἐπεὶ πολλοὶ κ.τ.λ. But apart from the

uncalled-for inversion thus assumed, as well as from the fact that the *ὑπόστασις* τ. κ. is held to be specially the *apostleship*, the *τῆς καυχήσεως* would be a quite superfluous addition ; on the other hand, with the reference to the general *λαλῶ* as modal definition of *ὑπόστασις* it is quite appropriate.

Ver. 18. That which carries him away to such foolishness, ver. 16 : *ἵνα κἀγὼ μικρ. τι καυχῆσ.* — *Seeing that many boast according to their flesh, so will I boast too*, namely, *κατὰ τ. σάρκα*.—Since *κατὰ τὴν σάρκα* is opposed to the *κατὰ κύριον* in ver. 17, and is parallel to the *ὡς ἐν ἀφροσύνῃ*, it cannot express the *objective* norm (comp. v. 16), or the *object* of the boasting (comp. Phil. iii. 3 ff. ; Gal. vi. 13), as Chrysostom and most expositors, including Emmerling, Flatt, and Osiander, explain it : *on account of external advantages*,¹ but it must denote the *subjective manner* of the *καυχᾶσθαι*, namely : *so that the καυχᾶσθαι is not guided by the Holy Spirit, but proceeds according to the standard of their natural condition as material, psychically determined, and striving against the Divine Spirit*, whence they are urged on to conceit, pride, ambition, etc.² Comp. Rückert : “according to the impulse of self-seeking personality ;” also de Wette, Ewald, Neander. Billroth, in accordance with his philosophy, takes it : “as individual, according to what one is as a single human being.” *κατὰ ἄνθρωπον* in 1 Cor. ix. 8 is not parallel. See on that passage. — Rückert denies that Paul after *κἀγὼ καυχῆσομαι* has again supplied in thought *κατὰ τ. σάρκα*, and thinks that he has prudently put it only in the protasis and *not* said it of *his own* glorying. But it necessarily follows, as well from the previous *οὐ λαλῶ κατὰ κύριον*, in which the *κατὰ τ. σάρκα* is already expressed *implicite*, as also from the following *τῶν ἀφρόνων*, among whom Paul is included as *κατὰ τὴν σάρκα καυχώμενος*. (v⁶) It is otherwise in John viii. 15.

Ver. 19. Not the motive inducing, but an ironical *ground encouraging*, the just said *κἀγὼ καυχῆσομαι* : *For willingly you are patient with the irrational* (to whom I with my *καυχᾶσθαι* belong), *since ye are rational people!* The more rational person is on that account the more tolerant toward fools. Hence not : *although* you are rational (Ewald and the older commentators).

Ver. 20. *Argumentum a majori* for what is said in ver. 19, bitterly sarcas-

¹ To this category belongs also the interpretation of Baur, who, however, refers *σάρξ* quite specially to Judaism as what is inherited, and therefore understands a boasting, *the object of which is only inherited accidental advantages*. The *διάκονοι Χριστοῦ*, ver. 23, and the apostle's subsequent glorying in *suffering*, ought to have dissuaded Baur from adopting such a view.

² Osiander is quite wrong in objecting to this interpretation that the *article* is against it, since Paul, when he means *σάρξ* in this sense, *never* puts the article after *κατά*. Paul, in fact, has the article only in this *single* passage, and elsewhere writes *always* *κατὰ σάρκα* (i.e. *conformably to flesh*) whether he uses *σάρξ* in the subjective or objective sense ; hence, so far as the article is con-

cerned, there is no means at all of comparison. Besides, *τὴν* here is very doubtful critically, because it is wanting in D* F G $\aleph^*$ min. Chrys. Dam., and is at variance with the Pauline usage. Osiander's further objection, that *κατὰ τὴν σάρκα*, as understood by us, is in the apostle's mouth unworthy of him for the apodosis, is likewise incorrect, for he is speaking *ironically* ; he wishes, in fact, to deal in boasting like a *fool!* As to the distinction between *κατὰ σάρκα* and *κατὰ τὴν σάρκα*, we may add that the one means : “*after the manner of natural humanity*,” the other, “*after the manner of their natural humanity*.” Comp. on Phil. i. 24, 22. In substance they are equivalent ; the latter only individualizes more concretely.

tic against the complaisance of the Corinthians towards the imperious (καταδουλοῖ), covetous (κατεσθίει), slyly capturing (λαμβάνει), arrogant (ἐπαίρεται), and audaciously violent (εἰς πρόσωπον δέρει) conduct of the false apostles. — καταδουλοῖ] *enslaves*. Comp. on Gal. ii. 4 ; Dem. 249. 2, and the passages in Wetstein. Paul has used the *active*, not the *middle*, as he leaves quite out of view the authority, whose lordship was aimed at ; beyond doubt, however (see the following points), the pseudo-apostles wished to make *themselves* lords of the church, partly in religious, *i.e.* Judaistic effort (comp. i. 24), partly also in a material respect (see what follows). — κατεσθίει] *swallows up*, devours, *sc.* ὑμᾶς, a figurative way of denoting not the *depriving them of independence* in a Christian point of view (Hofmann), which the reader could the less guess, since it was already said in καταδουλ., but the course of *greedily gathering to themselves all their property*. Comp. Ps. liii. 5 ; Matt. xxiii. 13 ; Luke xv. 30 ; Add. to Esth. i. 11 ; Hom. Od. iii. 315 : μή τοι κατὰ πάντα φάγωσι κτήματα, Dem. 992. 25 ; Aesch. c. Tim. 96. So also the Latin *devorare* (Quintil. viii. 6). Comp. also Jacobs, *ad. Anthol.* X. pp. 217, 230. Rückert, who will not concede the avarice of the opponents (see on ver. 12), explains it of *rending the church into parties*. Quite against the meaning of the word ; for in Gal. v. 15 ἀλλήλους stands alongside. And would it not be wonderful, if in *such* a company of worthlessness avarice were wanting ? — λαμβάνει] *sc.* ὑμᾶς, *captures you*. Comp. xii. 16. The figure is taken from *hunting*, and denotes the getting of somebody into one's power (Dem. 115. 10, 239. 17) in a secret way, by machinations, etc. (hence different from καταδουλοῖ). Comp. Reiske, *Ind. Dem.*, ed. Schaef. p. 322 : “vincire sibi mentes hominum deditas et veluti captas aut fascino quodam obstrictas.” This meaning is held by Wolf, Emmerling, Flatt, Billroth, Rückert, de Wette, Osiander, and others. The *usual* older interpretation : if any one *takes your goods* from you (so also Ewald), is to be set aside, because ὑμᾶς would necessarily have to be supplied, and because already the far stronger κατεσθίει has preceded. The same is the case with Hofmann's interpretation : if any one *seizes hold on you* (“*treats you as a thing*”), which after the two previous points would be nothing distinctive. — ἐπαίρεται] *exalts himself* (proudly). See the passages in Wetstein. As in this clause ὑμᾶς cannot be again supplied, and thus the supplying of it is interrupted, ὑμᾶς is again *added* in the *following* clause. — εἰς πρόσωπ. δέρει] represents an extraordinary, very disgraceful and insolent maltreatment. Comp. 1 Kings xxii. 24 ; Matt. v. 39 ; Luke xxii. 64 ; Acts xxiii. 2 ; Philostr. *vit. Apoll.* vii. 23. On the impetuous fivefold repetition of εἰ, comp. 1 Tim. v. 10.

Ver. 21. *In a disgraceful way* (for me) *I say, that we have been weak !* Ironical comparison of himself with the false apostles, who, according to ver. 20, had shown such energetic bravery in Corinth. For such things *we*, I confess it to my shame, were *too weak !* — κατὰ ἀτιμίαν] is the generally current paraphrase of the adverb (ἀτίμως), to be explained from the notion of measure (Bernhardy, p. 241). See Matthiae, p. 1359 f. — ὥς ὅτι] *as that* (see in general, Bast, *ad Gregor. Cor.* p. 52) introduces the *contents* of the shameful confession, not, however, in an absolutely objective way, but as a fact *conceived of* (ὥς). Comp. 2 Thess. ii. 2 ; Xen. *Hist.* iii. 2. 14 ; and the

passages from Joseph. *c. Ap.* i. 11, and Dionys. Hal. 9 (ἐπιγνοὺς, ὥς ὅτι ἐσχάτοις εἰσὶν οἱ κατακλεισθέντες) in Kypke, II. p. 268 ; also Isocr. *Busir.* arg. p. 362, Lang. : κατηγοροῦν αὐτοῦ, ὥς ὅτι καινὰ δαιμόνια εἰσφέρει, and the causal ὥς ὅτι, v. 19. The confession acquires by ὥς ὅτι something of *hesitancy*, which strengthens the touch of irony. — ἡμεῖς] is with great emphasis opposed to the men of power mentioned in ver. 20. — ἡσθενήσαμεν] namely, when we were there ; hence the *aorist*. On the *subject-matter*, comp. 1 Cor. ii. 2. — There agree, on the whole, with our view of the passage Bengel, Zachariae, Storr, Flatt, Schrader, de Wette, Neander, Osiander, and others. The main point in it is, that κατ' ἀτιμίαν denotes something shameful *for the apostle*, and λέγω has a *prospective* reference. Rückert also gives λέγω a prospective reference, but he diverges in regard to κατ' ἀτιμίαν, and supplies μέν : “ *in the point, indeed, to bring disgrace upon you, I must acknowledge that I have been weak.*” But in that case how unintelligibly would Paul have expressed himself ! For, apart from the arbitrary supplying of μέν, the definite ἀτιμίαν would be quite unsuitable. Paul, to be understood, must have written κατὰ τὴν ἀτιμίαν ὑμῶν (as regards your disgrace), or at least, with reference to ver. 20, κατὰ τὴν ἀτιμίαν (as regards the disgrace under consideration). Ewald and Hofmann take κατὰ ἀτιμ. rightly, but give λέγω a retrospective reference. In their view of ὥς ὅτι they diverge from one another, Ewald explaining it : *as if I from paternal weakness could not have chastised you myself* ; Hofmann, on the other hand, taking ὥς ὅτι as specifying the *reason* for saying such a thing (comp. v. 19). Against Ewald it may be urged that ὥς ὅτι does not mean *as if*, and that the five points previously mentioned are not brought under the general notion of *chastisement* ; and against both expositors, it may be urged that if κατὰ ἀτιμίαν were in reference to *what precedes* to mean a dishonour *of the apostle himself*, ἡμῶν must of necessity (in Phil. iv. 11, κατὰ is different) have been appended in order to be understood, because the previous points were a shame *of the readers* ; consequently the fine point would have lain just in an emphatically added ἡμῶν (such as κατὰ τὴν ἡμῶν ἀτιμίαν). In our interpretation, on the other hand, κατὰ ἀτιμίαν receives its definite reference through ὥς ὅτι ἡμεῖς (*that we*), and a ἡμῶν with ἀτιμίαν would have been quite superfluous. Most of the older commentators, too, though with many variations in detail, refer κατὰ ἀτιμ. λέγω to *what precedes*, but explain κατὰ ἀτιμ. of the shame of the *readers*. So Chrysostom,¹ Theophylact, Theodoret, Pelagius, Erasmus, Beza, Calvin, Hunnius, and others : *to your shame I say this* (ver. 20), *as if* [rather : *as because*] *we had been weak*, and could not have done the same thing, although we could do it but would not. Similarly also Billroth (followed by Olshausen) : *In a disgraceful way, I maintain, you put up with that injustice from the alleged reason that we are weak*” (rather : *had been*). But since κατὰ ἀτιμ. is not more precisely defined by a ἡμῶν, we have no right to give to it another definition than it has already received from Paul by the emphatic ἡμεῖς ἡσθενήσ. Against the retrospective reference of λέγω, see above. Finally, in that view the passage would lose

¹ Chrysostom observes that ὥς ὅτι κ.τ.λ. is given obscurely, in order to conceal the

unpleasantness of the meaning by the obscurity.

its ironical character, which however still continues, as is shown at once by the following ἐν ἀφροσύνῃ λέγω. — ἐν ᾧ δ' ἂν τις τολμᾷ κ.τ.λ.] Contrast with the ironical ἡσθενήσαμεν : *wherein, however, any one is bold—I say it irrationally—I too am bold* ; in whatever respect (*quocunque nomine*) any one possesses boldness, I too have boldness. In ἐν ᾧ lies the *real ground*, in which the τολμᾷν has its causal basis. As to τολμᾷ, comp. on x. 2. ἂν contains the conception : *should the case occur*. See Fritzsche, *Conject.* p. 35. — ἐν ἀφροσύνῃ λέγω] *Irony* ; for μή τις με δόξῃ ἄφρονα εἶναι, ver. 16. But Paul knew that the τολμῶ κἀγώ would appear to the enemies to be a foolish assertion.

Ver. 22. Now comes the specializing *elucidation* of that ἐν ᾧ δ' ἂν τις τολμᾷ, τολμῶ κἀγώ, presented so as directly to confront his enemies. Comp. Phil. iii. 5. Observe, however, that the opponents in *Corinth* must have still left circumcision out of the dispute.—The three names of honour, in which they boasted from their Judaistic point of view, are arranged *in a climax*, so that Ἑβραῖοι, which is not here in contrast to the Jews of the Diaspora, points to the hallowed *nationality*, Ἰσραηλῖται to the *theocracy* (Rom. ix. 4 f.), and σπέρμα Ἀβραάμ to the *Messianic privilege* (Rom. xi. 1, ix. 7, *al.*), without, however, these references excluding one another. The *interrogative* interpretation of the three points corresponds to the animation of the passage far more than the *affirmative* (Erasmus, Luther, Castalio, Estius, Flatt, and others).

Ver. 23. In the case of those three Jewish predicates the aim was reached and the emotion appeased by the brief and pointed κἀγώ. Now, however, he comes to the main point, to the *relation towards Christ* ; here κἀγώ cannot again suffice, but a ὑπὲρ ἐγώ must come in (comp. Theodoret), and the holy self-confidence of this ὑπὲρ ἐγώ gushes forth like a stream (comp. vi. 4 ff.) over his opponents, to tear down their fancies of apostolic dignity. — παραφρονῶν λαλῶ] also ironical, but stronger than ἐν ἀφροσ. λέγω : *in madness* (Herod. iii. 24 ; Dem. 1183. 1 ; Soph. Phil. 804) *I speak!* For Paul, in the consciousness of his own humility as of the hateful arrogance of his foes, conceives to himself a : παραφρονεῖ ! as the judgment which will be pronounced by the opponents upon his ὑπὲρ ἐγώ ; they will call it a παράφρων ἔπος (Eur. Hipp. 232) ! — ὑπὲρ ἐγώ] He thus concedes to his opponents the predicate διάκονοι Χριστοῦ only *apparently* (as he in fact could not *really* do so according to vv. 13–15) ; for in ὑπὲρ ἐγώ there lies the *cancelling* of the apparent concession, because, if he had granted them to be actually Christ's servants, it would have been absurd so say : *I am more!* Such, however, is the thought : “servants of Christ are they ? Well, if they are *such*, *still more* am I !” The meaning of ὑπὲρ ἐγώ is not, as *most* (even Osiander and Hofmann) assume : I am a servant of Christ in a higher degree than they” (1 Cor. xv. 10), but : *I am more than servant of Christ* ; for, as in κἀγώ there lay the meaning : *I am the same* (not in reference to the *degree*, but to the *fact*), so must there be in ὑπὲρ ἐγώ the meaning : *I am something more*. Thus, too, the meaning, in accordance with the strong παραφρονῶν λαλῶ, appears far more forcible and more telling against the opponents.¹ ὑπὲρ is

¹ So that the absolute ὑπέρ is not to be explained ὑπὲρ αὐτούς, but ὑπὲρ διακόνοῦς Χ.

used *adverbially* (Winer, p. 394 [E. T. 526]) ; but other undoubted Greek examples of this use of *ὑπέρ* are not found, as that in Soph. *Ant.* 514 (ὁ δ' ἀντιστὰς ὑπέρ) is of doubtful explanation. — ἐν κόποις περισσοτέρως κ.τ.λ.] Paul now exchanging sarcasm for deep earnest, under the impulse of a noble μεγαληγορία (Xen. *Apol.* i. 2) and “argumentis quae vere testentur pectus apostolicum” (Erasmus), begins his justification of the ὑπὲρ ἐγώ, so that ἐν is to be taken *instrumentally* : *through more exertions*, etc. The *comparative* is to be explained from the comparison with the κόποι of the opponents. The *adverb*, however, as often also in classic writers, is attached *adjectivally* (sc. οὔσι) to the substantive. So also de Wette.¹ Comp. Luke xxiv. 1 ; 1 Cor. xii. 31 ; Phil. i. 26 ; Gal. i. 13 ; see Ast, *ad Plat. Polit.* p. 371 f. ; Bernhardt, p. 338. Billroth, Osiander, Hofmann, and the older commentators incorrectly hold that εἰμί is to be supplied : “I am so in a yet much more extraordinary way in labours.” Apart from the erroneous explanation of ὑπὲρ ἐγώ, which is herein assumed, the subsequent πολλάκις is against it, for this with εἰμί supplied would be absurd. Hofmann would make a new series begin with ἐν θανάτ. πολλάκις ; but this is just a mere makeshift, which is at variance with the symmetrical onward flow of the passage with ἐν. Beza, Flatt, and many others supply ἦν or γέγονα ; but this is forbidden by ver. 26, where (after the parenthesis of vv. 24, 25) the passage is continued *without* ἐν, so that it would be impossible to supply ἦν or γέγονα further. — ἐν πληγ. ὑπερβαλλ.] *by strokes endured beyond measure*. — ἐν φυλακ. περισσοτ.] *by more imprisonments*. Clement, *ad Cor.* i. 5 : ὁ Παῦλος ὑπομονῆς βραβεῖον ἀπέσχευ ἐπτάκις δεσμὰ φορέσας, in which reckoning, however, the later imprisonments (in Jerusalem, Caesarea, Rome) are included. — ἐν θανάτοις πολλάκις] πολλάκις γὰρ εἰς κινδύνους παρεδόθην θάνατον ἔχοντας, Chrysostom. Comp. 1 Cor. xv. 31 ; 2 Cor. iv. 11 ; Rom. viii. 36 ; and Philo, *Flacc.* p. 990 A : προαποθνήσκω πολλοὺς θανάτους ὑπομένων ἀνθ' ἐνὸς τοῦ τελευταίου, Lucian, *Tyr.* 22 ; *Asin.* 23. See on this use of θάνατος in the plural, Stallbaum, *ad Plat. Crit.* p. 46 C ; Seidler, *ad Eur. El.* 479.

Vv. 24, 25. Parenthesis, in which definite proofs are brought forward for the ἐν θανάτοις πολλάκις. — ὑπὸ Ἰουδαίων] refers merely to πεντάκις . . . ἔλαβον ; for it is obvious of itself that the subsequent τρις ἐρραβδίσθην was a *Gentile* maltreatment. Paul seems to have had in his mind the order : *from Jews* . . . *from Gentiles*, which, however, he then abandoned. — τεσσαράκοντα παρὰ μίαν] sc. πληγὰς. Comp. on Luke xii. 47, and Ast, *ad Legg.* p. 433. παρά in the sense of subtraction ; see Herod. i. 120 ; Plut. *Caes.* 30 ; Wyttenb. *ad Plat.* VI. pp. 461, 1059 ; Winer, p. 377 [E. T. 503]. Deut. xxv. 3 ordains that *no one* shall be beaten *more than forty times*. In order, therefore, not to exceed the law by possible miscounting, only *nine and thirty* strokes were commonly given under the later administration of Jewish law.² See

Our view is already implied in the *plus* (not *magis*) *ego* of the Vulgate. Luther also has it, recently Ewald ; and Lachm. writes ὑπερεγώ as one word. Comp. also Klöpffer, p. 97.

¹ In the Vulgate this view has found distinct expression at least in the first clause :

“in laboribus plurimis.”

² This reason for omitting the last stroke is given by Maimonides (see Coccej. *ad Maccoth* iii. 10). Another Rabbinical view is that thirteen strokes were given with the three-thonged leathern scourge, so that the strokes amounted in all to thirty-nine.

Joseph. *Antt.* iv. 8. 21, 23, and the Rabbinical passages (especially from the treatise *Maccoth* in Surenhusius, IV. p. 269 ff.); in Wetstein, Schoettgen, *Hor.* p. 714 ff.; and generally, Saalschütz, *M. R.* p. 469. Paul rightly adduces his five scourgings (not mentioned in Acts) as proof of his ἐν θανάτοις πολλάκις, for this punishment was so cruel that not unfrequently the recipients died under it; hence there is no occasion for taking into account bodily weakness in the case of Paul. See Lund, *Jüd. Heiligth.* ed. Wolf, p. 539 f. — τρις ἐρραβδίσθη] One such scourging with rods by the Romans is reported in Acts xvi. 22; the two others are unknown to us. — ἅπαξ ἐλιδάσθ.] See Acts xiv. 19; Clem. 1 Cor. v. — τρις ἐνανάγ.] There is nothing of this in Acts, for the last shipwreck, Acts xxvii., was much later. How many voyages of the apostle may have remained quite unknown to us! and how strongly does all this list of sufferings show the incompleteness of the Book of Acts! — νυχθήμερον ἐν τῷ βυθῷ πεποίηκα] Lyra, Estius, Calovius, and others explain this of a *miracle*, as if Paul, actually sunk in the deep, had spent twenty-four hours without injury; but this view is at variance with the context. It is most naturally regarded as the sequel of one of these shipwrecks, namely, that he had, with the help of some floating wreck, tossed about on the sea for a day and night, often overwhelmed by the waves, before he was rescued. On βυθός, *the depth of the sea*, comp. LXX. Ex. xv. 5; Ps. lxxvii. 14, cvii. 24, *al.*; Bergl. *ad Alciphr.* i. 5, p. 10; and Wetstein *in loc.* — ποιεῖν of time: *to spend*, as in Acts xv. 33; Jas. iv. 13; Jacobs, *ad Anthol.* IX. p. 449. The *perfect* is used because Paul, after he has simply *related* the previous points, looks back on this last *from the present time* (comp. Kühner, § 439, 1a); there lies in this change of tenses a climactic vividness of representation.

Ver. 26 f. After the parenthesis of vv. 24, 25, the series begun in ver. 23 is now continued, dropping, however, the instrumental ἐν, which is not to be supplied, and running on merely with the instrumental *dative*—*through frequent journeys, through dangers from rivers, etc.* The expression ὁδοιπορ. πολλάκις is not to be taken as saying too little, for Paul was not constantly engaged in journeys (comp. his somewhat lengthy sojourns at Ephesus and at Corinth); wherefore he had the less occasion here to put another expression in place of the πολλάκις which belonged, as it were, to the symmetry of the context (vv. 23, 27). Hofmann wrongly joins πολλάκις with κινδύνους, and takes πολλάκ. κινδύνους as in apposition to ὁδοιπορίαις: “*journeys, which were often dangers.*” As if Paul were under the necessity of expressing (if he wished to express at all) the quite simple thought: ὁδοιπορίαις πολλάκις ἐπικινδύνους (journeys which were often dangerous), in a way so singularly enigmatical as that which Hofmann imputes to him. Besides, if the following elements are meant to specify the dangers of *travel*, the two points ἐκ γένους and ἐξ ἐθνῶν at least *are* not at all specific *perils* incident to *travel*. And how much, in consequence of this er-

See in general, Lund, p. 540 f. According to *Maccoth* iii. 12, the breast, the right and the left shoulder, received each thirteen of the thirty-nine strokes. But it cannot be

proved from the Rabbins that it was *on this account* that the fortieth was not added, as Bengel, Wetstein, and others assume.

roneous connection of ὁδοιπορ. πολλάκ. κινδυν., does Hofmann mar the further flow of the passage, which he subdivides as ποταμῶν κινδύνους, ληστῶν κινδύνους, ἐκ γένους κινδύνους κ.τ.λ. down to ἐν θαλάσῃ κινδύνους, but thereafter punctuates : ἐν ψευδαδέλφοις κόπῳ κ. μόχθῳ ἐν ἀγρυπνίαις, πολλάκις ἐν λιμῷ κ. δίψει, ἐν νηστείαις, πολλάκις ἐν ψυχ. κ. γυμν.¹ In this way is lost the whole beautiful and swelling symmetry of this outburst, and particularly the essential feature of the weighty anaphora, in which the emphatic word (and that is in ver. 26 κινδύνους) is placed *first* (comp. *e.g.* Hom. *Il.* x. 228 ff., i. 436 ff., ii. 382 ff., v. 740 f.; Arrian, *Diss.* i. 25; Quinctil. ix. 3. Comp. also ver. 20, vii. 2; Phil. iii. 2, iv. 8 *al.*). — κινδ. ποταμῶν κ.τ.λ.] The *genitive* denotes the dangers arising from rivers (in crossing, swimming through them, in inundations, and the like) and from robbers. Comp. Heliod. ii. 4. 65; κινδύνοι θαλασσῶν, Plat. *Pol.* i. p. 332 E; *Euthyd.* p. 279; Ecclus. xliii. 24. — The κινδύνους, each time prefixed has a strong oratorical emphasis. Auct. ad Herenn. iv. 28. There lies in it a certain tone of triumph. — ἐκ γένους] *on the part of race, i.e. on the part of the Jews*, Acts vii. 19; Gal. i. 14. The opposite : ἐξ ἐθνῶν. — ἐν πόλει, *in city*, as in Damascus, Jerusalem, Ephesus, and others; the opposite is ἐν ἐρημίᾳ, *in desert*. On the form of expression, comp. ἐν οἴκῳ, ἐν ἀγρῷ, ἐν μεγάρῳ, and the like. Xen. *de rep. Lac.* viii. 3 : ἐν πόλει καὶ ἐν στρατιᾷ καὶ ἐν οἴκῳ. — ἐν ψευδαδέλφοις] *among false brethren, i.e. among Judaistic pseudo-Christians*, Gal. ii. 4, οἱ ὑπεκρίνοντο τὴν ἀδελφότητα, Chrysostom. Why should not these, with their hostile and often vehement opposition to the Pauline Christianity (comp. Phil. iii. 2), have actually prepared dangers for him? Rückert, without reason, finds this inconceivable, and believes that Paul here means an occasion on which *non-Christians*, under cover of the Christian name, had sought to entice the apostle into some danger (? κινδύνους). — Ver. 27. κόπῳ κ. μόχθῳ] *by trouble and toil*; comp. 1 Thess. ii. 9.; 2 Thess. iii. 8.² Then with ἐν ἀγρυπν. there again appears the instrumental ἐν. On ἐν λιμῷ κ.τ.λ., comp. Deut. xxviii. 48. — ἐν νηστείαις πολλάκις] *by frequent fastings*. Here precisely, where ἐν λιμῷ κ. δίψει, and so *involuntary* fasting, precedes, the reference of νηστ. to *voluntary* fasting is perfectly clear (in opposition to Rückert, de Wette, Ewald). Comp. on vi. 5. Estius aptly observes : “jejunia ad purificandam mentem et edomandam carnem sponte assumpta.” Comp. Theodoret and Pelagius. (w^o)

Ver. 28. *Apart from that which occurs beside* (beside what had been mentioned hitherto) *there is for me the daily attention, the anxiety for all the churches.*³ He will not adduce more particulars than he has brought forward down to γυμνότητι, but will simply mention further a general fact, that

¹ So that πολλάκ. ἐν λιμῷ κ. δίψει would belong to ἀγρυπνίαις, and πολλάκ. ἐν ψύχει κ. γυμνότητι to νηστείαις, each as a circumstance of aggravation; while both ἐν ἀγρυπνίαις and ἐν νηστείαις belong to κόπῳ κ. μόχθῳ.

² From these passages, combined with Acts xx. 31, we may at the same time explain the ἀγρυπνίαι, which Hofm. interprets of night-watchings in *anxiety about the*

pseudo-Christians. This results from his error in thinking that all the points in ver. 27 are to be referred to ἐν ψευδαδέλφ.

³ Accordingly the comma after ἡμέραν is to be deleted. If μέριμνα κ.τ.λ. be (as is the usual view) taken as a clause by itself, the ἐστὶ to be supplied is not a copula, but : *exists*. But according to the right reading and interpretation, ἡ ἐπιστ. μοι, as an independent point, would thus be too general.

he has daily to bear anxiety for all the churches. On *χωρίς* with the genitive : *apart from*, see Stallbaum, *ad. Plat. Apol. S.* p. 35 C. The emphasis is on *πασῶν*. Theodoret : *πάσης γὰρ τῆς οἰκουμένης ἐν ἑμαυτῷ περιφέρω τὴν μέριμναν*. Nevertheless, this *πασῶν* is not, with Bellarmine and other Roman Catholic writers, as well as Ewald *et al.*, to be limited merely to Pauline churches, nor is it to be pressed in its full generality, but rather to be taken as a *popular* expression for his *unmeasured* task. He has to care for *all*. Chrysostom, Theophylact, and others attach *χωρ. τ. παρ.* to what precedes, and separate it from what follows by a full stop ; but this only makes the latter unnecessarily abrupt. Luther, Castalio, Bengel, and many others, including Flatt, Billroth (but uncertainly), and Olshausen, consider *ἡ ἐπίστασις κ.τ.λ.* (or, according to their reading : *ἡ ἐπισύστασις κ.τ.λ.*) as an abnormal apposition to *τῶν παρεκτός* : not to mention what still occurs besides, namely, etc. This is unnecessarily harsh, and *χωρὶς τῶν παρεκτός* would withal only be an empty formula.—*τὰ παρεκτός* is : *quae praeterea eveniunt*,¹ not, as Beza and Bengel, following the Vulgate, hold : “*quae extrinsecus eum adoriebantur*” (Beza), so that *either* what follows is held to be in apposition (Bengel : previously he has described the *proprius labores*, now he names the *alienos secum communicatos*), or *τῶν παρεκτός* is referred to what precedes, and what follows now expresses the *inward* cares and toils (Beza, comp. Erasmus). Linguistic usage is against this, for *παρεκτός* never means *extrinsecus*, but always *beside*, in the sense of *exception*. See Matt. v. 32 ; Acts xxvi. 29 ; Aq. Deut. i. 36 ; *Test. XII. Patr.* p. 631 ; *Geopon.* xiii. 15. 7 ; *Etym. M.* p. 652, 18. This also in opposition to Ewald : “without the *unusual* things,” with which what is *daily* is then put in contrast (comp. Calvin). Hofmann, following the reading *ἡ ἐπισύστασις μου*, would, instead of *τῶν παρεκτός*, write *τῶν παρ' ἐκτός*, which is, in his view, *masculine*, and denotes those *coming on the apostle from without* (the Christian body), whose *attacks* on his doctrine he must continually withstand. With this burden he associates the care of all the many *churches*, which lie continually on his soul. These two points are introduced by *χωρίς*, which is the adverbial *besides*. This new interpretation (even apart from the reading *ἐπισύστασις*, which is to be rejected on critical grounds) cannot be accepted, (1) because *οἱ παρ' ἐκτός*, for which Paul would have written *οἱ ἔξω* (1 Cor. v. 12 ; Col. iv. 5 ; 1 Thess. iv. 12) or *οἱ ἔξωθεν* (1 Tim. iii. 7), is an expression without demonstrable precedent, since even Greek writers, while doubtless using *οἱ ἐκτός*, *extranei* (Polyb. ii. 47. 10, v. 37. 6 ; comp. Eccclus. Praef. I.), do not use *οἱ παρ' ἐκτός* ; (2) because the two parts of the verse, notwithstanding their quite different contents, stand abruptly (without *καί* or *μὲν . . . δέ*, or other link of connection) side by side, so that we have not even *ἡ δὲ μέριμνά μου* (over against the *ἐπισύστασις μου*) instead of the bare *ἡ μέριμνα* ; and (3) because the adverbial *χωρίς* in the sense assumed is foreign to the N. T., and even in the classical passages in question (see from Thucydides, Krüger, on i. 61. 3) it does not mean *praeterea* generally, but more strictly *scorsim*, *separatim*, *specially and taken by itself*.²

¹ The Armenian version gives instead of *παρεκτός* : *ἄλλων θλίψεων*. A correct interpretation. Chrysostom exaggerates : *πλε-*

ίονα τὰ παραλειφθέντα τῶν ἀπαριθμηθέντων.

² So, too, in the passage, Thuc. ii. 31, 2, adduced in Passow's *Lexicon* by Rost and

See Ellendt, *Lex. Soph.* II. p. 974. But the two very *general* categories, which it is to introduce, would not suit this sense.—*ἡ ἐπίστασις*] may mean *either*: the daily *halting* (comp. Xen. *Anab.* ii. 4. 26; Polyb. xiv. 8. 10; Soph. *Ant.* 225: πολλὰς γὰρ ἔσχον φροντίδων ἐπιστάσεις, *multas moras deliberationibus effectas*), or: the daily *attention*.¹ See Lobeck, *ad Phryn.* p. 527; Schweigh. *Lex. Polyb.* p. 265. This signification is most accordant with the context on account of the following *ἡ μέριμνα κ.τ.λ.* Rückert, without any sanction of linguistic usage, makes it: the *throng* towards me, the concourse resorting to me on official business.² So also Osiander and most older and more recent expositors explain the *Recepta ἐπισύστασις μου* or *ἐπισύστ. μοι*. But likewise at variance with usage, since *ἐπισύστασις* is always (even in Num. xxvi. 9) used in the *hostile* sense: *hostilis concursio*, *tumultus*, as it has also been taken here by Chrysostom, Theodoret, Theophylact, Beza,³ Bengel, and others. See Acts xxiv. 12, and the passages in Wetstein and Loesner, p. 230.—The *μοί*; which, in the interpretation of *ἐπιστ.* as *concourse*, would have to be taken as appropriating dative (Bernhardy, p. 89), is, according to our view of *ἐπιστ.*, to be conceived as dependent on the *ἔστι* to be supplied.

Ver. 29. Two characteristic traits for illustrating the *μέριμνα πασῶν τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν*. Chrysostom aptly says: *ἐπήγαγε καὶ τὴν ἐπίτασιν τῆς φροντίδος*, and that for the *individual members* (Acts xx. 31).—As *ἀσθενεῖ* with *σκανδαλίζεται*, so also *ἀσθενῶ* with *πυροῦμαι* forms a climax—and in a way highly appropriate to the subject! For in point of fact he could not in the second clause say: *καὶ οὐ σκανδαλίζομαι*.—The *meaning* of the verse is to *express the most cordial and most lively sympathy* (comp. 1 Cor. xii. 26) *of his care* amidst the dangers, to whom the Christian character and life of the brethren are exposed: “*Who is weak* as regards his faith, conscience, or his Christian morality, *and I am not weak*, do not feel myself, by means of the sympathy of my care, transplanted into the same position? *Who is offended*, led astray to unbelief and sin, *and I do not burn*, do not feel myself seized by burning pain of soul?” Semler and Billroth, also de Wette (comp. Luther’s gloss), mix up what is foreign to the passage, when they make *ἀσθενῶ* apply to the *condescension* of the apostle, who would give no offence to the weak, 1 Cor. ix. 22. And Emmerling (followed by Olshausen) quite erroneously takes it: “*quem afflictum dicas, si me non dicas? quem calamitatem oppetere, si me non vis premi, quin uri memores?*” In that case it must have run *καὶ*

by Hofmann, where *χωρίς* further introduces a *separate* army contingent, which is *counted by itself*.

¹ Gregory of Nazianzus has *ἐπιστασία*, which is to be regarded as a good gloss. See Lobeck, *l.c.*; Kühner, *ad Xen. Mem.* i. 5. 2, var.

² *ἐπίστασις* does not *once* mean the *pressing on* (active) the *crowding*. In 2 Macc. vi. 3 (in opposition to Grimm *in loc.*), *ἡ ἐπίστασις τῆς κακίας* is the *setting in*, the *coming on*, *i.e.* the *beginning* of misfortune (Polyb. i. 12. 6, ii. 40. 5, *al.*). In Dion. Halicarn. vi. 31, the reading is to be changed into *ἐπίθεσιν*. In

Polyb. i. 26. 12, it means the *position*. Nevertheless, Buttm. *neut. Gr.* p. 156 [E. T. 180], agrees with Rückert.

³ Chrys: οἱ θόρυβοι, αἱ ταραχαί, αἱ πολιορκίαι τῶν δήμων καὶ τῶν πόλεων ἔφοδοι. Beza renders the whole verse: “Absque iis, quae extrinsecus eveniunt, urget agmen illud in me quotidie consurgens, *i.e.* sollicitudo de omnibus ecclesiis.” Comp. Ewald: “the *daily onset* of a thousand troubles and difficulties *on him*.” Bengel: “obturbatio illorum, qui doctrinae vitaeque perversitate Paulo molestiam exhibebant, v. gr. Gal. vi. 17.”

οὐκ ἐγὼ ἀσθενῶ ; besides, σκανδαλίζεσθαι never means *calamitatibus affici*, but constantly denotes religious or moral offence ; and lastly, σκανδαλίζεται and πυροῦμαι would yield a quite inappropriate climax (Paul must have repeated σκανδαλίζομαι). — ἀσθενεῖ] comp. Rom. iv. 19, xiv. 1, 2, 21 ; 1 Cor. viii. 9, 11 ; 1 Thess. v. 14 ; Acts xx. 35. The correspondence of σκανδαλίζεται in the climax forbids us to understand it of *suffering* (Chrysostom, Beza, Flatt). — πυροῦμαι] *What* emotion is denoted by verbs of burning, is decided on each occasion by the context (comp. 1 Cor. vii. 9 ; see in general on Luke xxiv. 32), which here presents a climax to ἀσθενῶ, therefore suggests far more naturally the idea of violent *pain* (comp. Chrys.: καθ' ἑκάστον ὠδυνᾶτο μέλος) than that of *anger* (Luther : “it galled him hard ;” comp. Bengel, Rückert). Augustine says aptly : “quanto major caritas, tanto majores plagae de peccatis alienis.” Comp. on the expression, the Latin *ardere doloribus*, *faces doloris*, and the like (Kühner, *ad Cic. Tusc.* ii. 25. 61) ; also 3 Macc. iv. 2, and Abresch, *ad Aesch. Sept.* 519. — Lastly, we have to note *the change in the form of the antitheses*, which emerges with the increasing vividness of feeling in the two halves of the verse : οὐκ ἀσθενῶ and οὐκ ἐγὼ πυροῦμαι. In the former case the negation attaches itself to the verb, in the latter to the person. Who is weak without *weakness* likewise occurring in me ? who is offended without its being *I*, who *is burning* ? Of the *offence* which *another* takes, *I* on my part have the *pain*.

Ver. 30. Result of the previous passage—from ver. 23 onward¹ in proof of that ὑπὲρ ἐγὼ in ver. 23—put, however, *asyndetically* (without οὖν), as is often the case with the result after a lengthened chain of thoughts (Dissen, *ad Pind.* Exc. II. *de asynd.* p. 278) ; an asyndeton *summing up* (Nägelsbach on the *Iliad*, p. 284, ed. 3). *If I must boast* (as is the given case in confronting my enemies), *I will boast in that which concerns my weakness* (my sufferings, conflicts, and endurances, which exhibit my *weakness*), and thus practise quite another *καυχᾶσθαι*² than that of my opponents, who boast in their power and strength. In this τὰ τ. ἀσθ. μ. *καυχ.* there lies a holy oxymoron. To refer it to the ἀσθενεῖν in ver. 29 either *alone* (Rückert) or *inclusively* (de Wette), is inadmissible, partly because that ἀσθενεῖν was a partaking in the weakness of *others*, partly because the future is to be referred to what is meant only *to follow*. And it does *actually* follow ; hence we must not, with Wieseler (*on Gal.* p. 596), generalize the future into the expression of a *maxim*, whereby a reference to the past is facilitated. So also in the main Hofmann. — *καυχᾶσθαι*, with *accusative*, as ix. 2.

Ver. 31. He is now about to illustrate (see vv. 32, 33) the just announced τὰ τῆς ἀσθενείας μου *καυχῆσομαι* by an historical enumeration of his sufferings from the beginning, but he first prefaces his detailed illustration (“rem quasi difficilem dicturus,” Pelagius) *by the assurance, in God's name, that he*

¹ Everything in this outburst, from ver. 23 onward, presented him, in fact, as the servant of Christ *attested by much suffering*. Thus, if he must *make boast*, he wishes to boast in nothing else than his *weakness*. And this *καυχᾶσθαι* is then, after an assur-

ance of his truthfulness (ver. 31), actually begun by him (ver. 32) in concrete historical form.

² Chrys. exclaims : Οὗτος ἀποστολικὸς χαρακτήρ, διὰ τούτων ὑφαίνεται εὐαγγέλιον.

narrates nothing false. The objections taken against referring his assurance to *what follows* (see Estius and Rückert)—that the incident adduced in ver. 32 stands, as regards importance, out of all proportion to so solemn an assurance, and the like—lose their weight, when we reflect that Paul has afterwards again *broken off* (see xii. 1) the narrative begun in vv. 32, 33, and therefore, when writing his assurance, referred it not merely to this single incident, but also to all which he had it in his mind still to subjoin (which, however, was left undone owing to the interruption). *Others* refer the oath to *what precedes*, and that *either* to everything said from ver. 23 onward (Estius, Calovius, Flatt, Olshausen), or to ver. 30 alone (Morus, Rückert, Hofmann; Billroth gives a choice between the two). But in the former case logically we could not but have expected ver. 31 after ver. 29, and in the latter case the assurance would appear as quite irrelevant, since Paul at once begins *actually to give the details* of his τὰ τῆς ἀσθεν. μου καυχῆσομαι (ver. 31 f.). — ὁ θεὸς κ. πατὴρ τ. κυρ. ἡμ. 'I. X.] Union of the general and of the specifically Christian idea of God. Ἡμῶν γὰρ θεὸς τοῦ δὲ κυρίου πατὴρ, Theodoret. Comp. on 1 Cor. xv. 24 and Eph. i. 3. — ὁ ὢν εὐλογητὸς κ.τ.λ.] appended by the apostle's pious feeling, in order to strengthen the sacredness of the assurance. "Absit ut abutar ejus testimonio, cui omnis laus et honor debetur in omnem aeternitatem," Calovius.

Vv. 32, 33. Paul now actually begins his καυχᾶσθαι τὰ τῆς ἀσθενείας αὐτοῦ, and that by relating the peril and flight which took place at the very commencement of his work. Unfortunately, however (for how historically important for us would have been a further continuation of this tale of suffering!), yet upon the emergence of a proper feeling that the continuation of this glorying in suffering would not be in keeping with his apostolic position, he renounces the project, breaks off again at once after this first incident (xii. 1), and passes on to something far higher and more peculiar—to the revelations made to him. The expositors, overlooking this *breaking off* (noted also by Hilgenfeld), have suggested many arbitrary explanations as to why Paul narrates *this* incident in particular (he had, in fact, been in much worse perils!),¹ and that with so solemn asseveration and at such length. Billroth, *e.g.* (comp. Flatt), says that he wished to direct attention to the *first* danger pre-eminently by way of evidence that everything said from ver. 23 onward was true (ver. 31). In that case he would doubtless have written something like ἤδη γὰρ ἐν Δαμασκῷ, or in such other way as to be so *understood*. Olshausen contents himself with the remark that Paul has only made a supplementary mention of the event as the first persecution; and Rückert even conjectures that it was by pure *accident* that Paul noted by way of supplement and treated in detail this story occurring to his recollection! Osiander thinks that he singled it out thus on account of its connection (?) in subject-matter and time with the following revelation, and, as it were, by way of further consecration of his official career. Comp. also Wieseler on *Gal.* p. 595, who likewise considers the narrative as simply a

¹ Arbitrary explanations are already given by Chrysostom (comp. Bengel, Ewald, and others): because the incident was *older and less known*; and by Pelagius: because in Damascus the Jews had stirred up *etiam principes gentium* against Paul.

suitable historical introduction to the revelation that follows. But we do not see the purpose served by this detailed introduction,—which, withal, as such, would have no independent object whatever,—nor yet, again, the purpose served by the interruption in xii. 1. According to Hofmann, the mention of this means of rescue, of which he had made use, and which many a one *with merely natural courage* would on the score of honour not have consented to employ, is intended to imply a confession of his *weakness*. The idea of weakness, however, is not at all here the opposite of the natural courage of honour, but rather that of the passive undergoing of all the *παθήματα* of Christ, the long chain of which, in Paul's case, had its first link historically in that flight from Damascus. Calvin correctly names this flight the “*tirocinium Pauli*.” — *ἐν Δαμασκῷ*] stands as an anacoluthon. When Paul wrote it, having already in view a further specification of place for an incident to follow, he had purposed to write, instead of the unsuitable *τὴν Δαμασκηῶν πόλιν*, something else (such as *τὰς πύλας*), but then left out of account the *ἐν Δαμασκῷ* already written. It is a strange fancy to which Hofmann has recourse, that *τ. Δαμασκ. πόλιν* is meant to be a narrower conception than *ἐν Δαμασκῷ*. — *ἐθνάρχης*] *prefect* (Josephus, *Antt.* xiv. 7. 2 ; 1 Macc. xiv. 47, xv. 1 ; Strabo, xvii. p. 798 ; Lucian, *Macrob.* 17), an appellation of Oriental provincial governors. See in general, Joh. Gottlob Heyne, *de ethnarcha Aretae*, Witeb. 1755, p. 3 ff. The incident itself described is identical with that narrated in Acts ix. 24 f. No doubt in Acts the watching of the gates is described to the *Jews*, and here, to the *ethnarch* ; but the reconciliation of the two narratives is itself very naturally effected through the assumption that the ethnarch caused the gates to be watched by *the Jews themselves* at their suggestion (comp. Heyne, *l.c.* p. 39). “Jewish gold had perhaps also some effect with the Emir,” Michaelis. — *τὴν Δαμασκ. πόλιν*] namely, by occupying the gates so that Paul might not get out. Regarding the temporary dominion over Damascus held at that time by Aretas, the Arabian king, and father-in-law of Herod Antipas, see on Acts, Introd. § 4, and observe that Paul would have had no reason for adding *Ἀρέτα τοῦ βασιλέως*, if at the very time of the flight the Roman city had not been exceptionally (and temporarily) subject to Aretas—a state of foreign rule for the time being, which was to be brought under the notice of the reader. Hofmann thinks that the *chief of the Arabian inhabitants* in the Roman city was meant ; but with the less ground, since Paul was a *Jew* and had come from *Jerusalem*, and consequently would not have belonged at all to the *jurisdiction* of such a tribal chief (if there had been one). He went to Arabia (Gal. i. 17) only *in consequence of* this incident. — *διὰ θυρίδος* *by means of a little door* (Plato, *Pol.* ii. p. 359 D ; Lucian, *Asin.* 45). It was doubtless an opening high up in the city wall, closed, perhaps, with a lid or lattice. — *ἐν σαργάνῃ*] *in a wickerwork*, i.e. *basket* (Lucian, *Lexiph.* 6). Comp. Acts ix. 25 : *ἐν σπυρίδι*. — On the description itself Theodoret rightly remarks ; τὸ τοῦ κινδύνου μέγεθος τῷ τρόπῳ τῆς φυγῆς παρεδήλωσε.

NOTES BY AMERICAN EDITOR.

(N⁶) “*A godly jealousy.*” Ver. 2.

This phrase, given in the A. V. and retained in the Revision, includes all the possible meanings of the original ; for a godly jealousy may be at once one of which God is the author or the object, one that He has, or that is pleasing to Him, or that is extraordinarily great.

(O⁶) “*The serpent.*” Ver. 3.

The comparison made here is a clear evidence that Paul accepted the narrative of the fall as an historical fact. For a fable would give no ground for his fear, and would be inconsistent with the earnestness of this passage. The comparison suggests that the serpent was a mouthpiece of a spiritual foe.

(P⁶) *Paul's manifestation.* Ver. 6.

A better sense than that of the T. R., which Dr. Meyer adopts, is obtained from the reading of all the later editors, which gives an active participle : *have made manifest*, viz. the Apostle's knowledge of divine revelations and spiritual truths.

(Q⁶) *Paul's gratuitous service.* Ver. 7.

This verse and the following seem designed to answer the charges founded on the fact that he took no money from the Corinthian church, but supported himself by his own labours and the gifts of others. The charges were that a real apostle could not thus abstain from claiming his undoubted right, and that Paul's doing it indicated a want of confidence in the Corinthians. He vindicates his course, and declares his intention to persist in it.

(R⁶) “*Satan transformed.*” Ver. 14.

It would hardly be possible to affirm the personality of Satan more strongly than is done here. The practical suggestion is also of immense weight—Satan does not come to us as Satan.

(S⁶) “*Whose end shall be according to their works.*” Ver. 15.

On this Beet remarks that Paul had no expectation that all men would eventually be saved. For he is evidently thinking of bad works, and therefore of a bad end. But if finally restored, the end of all men and of these servants of Satan would be endless happiness, in whose light the most terrible and prolonged bygone torments will, as endless and glorious ages roll by, dwindle into insignificance.

(T⁶) *Paul's boasting.* Ver. 16.

Three times he has attempted to begin his boast, first in x. 18, when he is interrupted by the recollection of the hollowness of the boast of his opponents and compelled to assert the reality of his own ; again, in xi. 1, when he is checked by the recollection of the difficulty of pressing it on readers so perverted as the Corinthians by the influence of their false teachers ; again, in xi. 6, when he is led aside to answer the charge arising out of his refusal of support. Now once more he returns to the point, and now for the first time carries it through. He is

still oppressed by the consciousness of the seeming senselessness of such self-praise ; but he defends himself on two grounds : that he is driven to it by the pretensions of his opponents ; and that he is speaking, not of his higher gifts, of which he might reasonably be proud, but of those very points in his conduct and character which had given occasion to his opponents to charge him with "weakness," x. 10. (Stanley).

(v⁶) "*Not after the Lord.*" Ver. 17.

This phrase means, "Not as Christ would have me speak, but in the person of a fool." Such an utterance is not inconsistent with the Apostle's claim to inspiration. For the simple end of inspiration is to secure infallibility in the communication of truth. It does not sanctify, nor does it preclude the natural play of the intellect or of the feelings. Even if therefore this conduct of Paul was due to human weakness, that would not prove that he was not under the inspiration of God. But such an assumption is needless. There was nothing wrong in his self-laudation. He never appears more truly humble than when these references to his labours and sufferings were wrung from him, filling him with a feeling of self-contempt. All that the expression implies is that self-praise, in itself considered, is not the work of a Christian ; it is not a work to which the Spirit of Christ impels a believer. But when it is necessary to the vindication of the truth or the honour of religion, it becomes a duty (Hodge).

(v⁶) "*According to the flesh.*" Ver. 18.

Surely there is no necessity of supplying these words at the end of the verse. What the Apostle means is, "As many boast from unworthy motives, I also will boast." If they did it from bad motives, he might well do it from good motives ; and that he did it from such motives the whole section shows.

(w⁶) *Paul's toils and sufferings.* Ver. 27.

On this graphic statement Stanley justly remarks that "it represents a life in the Western world [may we not add, in the Eastern also ?] hitherto without precedent. Self-devotion for some special national cause had been often seen before ; the career of Socrates was a lifelong service to humanity ; but a continual self-devotion, involving hardships like those here described, and extending over so long a period and in behalf of no local or family interest, but for the interest of mankind at large, was, down to this period, a thing unknown. Paul did all this, and Paul was the first who did it."—"This passage makes even the most laborious of the modern ministers of Christ hide their faces in shame. What have they ever done or suffered to compare with what this apostle did ? It is a consolation to know that Paul is now as pre-eminent in glory as he was here in suffering" (Hodge).—Stanley adds further : "It is remarkable that while there is nothing in this account which contradicts, yet the greater part of it goes far beyond the narrative of the Acts. It shows that the biography of the Apostle, unlike most biographies of heroes and saints (*e.g.* Xavier), instead of overrating, underrates the difficulties and sufferings which we learn from the Apostle's own account, the accuracy of which is guaranteed by the extreme and apparently unfeigned reluctance with which it is brought forward."

CHAPTER XII.

Ver. 1. *καυχᾶσθαι δὴ*] So also Tisch., following K M and most min. Arm. and the Greek Fathers. But B D** E F G I, and many min., also Syr. utr. Arr. Vulg. It. Ambrosiast. have the reading *καυχᾶσθαι δεῖ*, which Griesb. has recommended, and Scholz, Lachm. Rück. have adopted. D* S* 114, Copt. Slav. codd. Lat. Theophyl. have *καυχᾶσθαι δέ*, which Fritzsche, *Diss.* II. p. 122 f., prefers. The testimonies for *καυχᾶσθαι δεῖ* preponderate so decidedly that we are not entitled to derive *δεῖ* from xi. 30. On the other hand, the apparent want of connection in *καυχ. δεῖ οὐ συμφ.* was sufficient occasion, partly for changing *δεῖ* into *δέ*, or by means of itacism into *δὴ* (the latter Reiche defends and Ewald follows, also Hofm.), partly for prefixing an *εἰ* to the *καυχ.* from xi. 30 (S** 39, Lect. 17, Vulg. Pel.). — *οὐ συμφέρει μοι, ἐλεύσομαι γάρ*] Lachm. and Rück. read *οὐ συμφέρον μὲν, ἐλεύσομεν δέ* (Lachm.: *δὲ καί*, after B), supported by B F G S, and in part by some min. vss. and Fathers. But *μὲν . . . δέ* betrays itself as a correction by way of gloss of the difficult *γάρ*, in which *μοί* was supplanted by *μὲν*, and *γάρ* by *δέ*. The question whether *συμφέρον* is original instead of *συμφέρει*, is decided by the circumstance that, according to the codd., the reading *συμφέρον* is connected with the reading *μὲν . . . δέ*, and hence falls with it. — Ver. 3. *ἐκτός*] B D* E* S, Method. in Epiph. have *χωρίς*. So Lachm. Tisch. and Rück. Rightly; *ἐκτός* is from ver. 2. The subsequent *οὐκ οἶδα* is deleted by Lachm., but only on the authority of B, Method. — Ver. 6. *τί*] is doubtless wanting in B D*** E** F G S* 37, 67** Arm. Boern. Tol. Harl.** codd. Lat. Or., and is deleted by Lachm. and Rück. But how easily it was left out, being regarded as utterly superfluous, and even as confusing! — Ver. 7. Before the first *ἵνα* Lachm. has *διό*, following A B F G S 17, Boern. An insertion for the sake of connection, occasioned by the not recognizing the inverted order of the words, so that *καὶ τῇ ὑπερβ. τῶν ἀποκαλ.* was attached in some way to what goes before (with some such meaning as this: in order that no one may get a higher opinion of me . . . *even through the abundance of the revelations*). — The second *ἵνα μὴ ὑπεραίρωμαι* is wanting in A D E F G S* 17, and several vss. and Fathers (bracketed by Lachm.); but the emphasis of the repetition being overlooked, the words have been passed over as having been used already. — Ver. 9. *δύναμις μου*] *μου* is wanting in A* B D* F G S, and several vss. and Fathers. Deleted by Bengel, Lachm. Tisch. Considering, however, the no small weight of the testimonies for *μου* (A** D*** E K L S** and almost all min. vss. Or. Chrys. Theodoret), and seeing that the syllable *μου* might easily be passed over after the syllable *μις*, the *Recepta* is to be preserved, its sense also being necessary according to the whole context. — *τελειοῦται*] A B D* F G S* have *τελείται*. So Lachm. Tisch. and Rück. Rightly; the former is an interpretation. — Ver. 11. After *ἁφρων* Elz. has *καυχώμενος*, against decisive evidence. An exegetical addition. — Ver. 12. *ἐν σημείοις*] *ἐν* is wanting in A B D* S 17, 39, 71, *al.* Vulg. ms. Clar. Germ. Tol. and Fathers; while F G, Boern. Syr. Chrys. Ambrosiast. have *καί. ἐν* is mechanically repeated from what precedes, and with Lachm. Tisch. and Rück.

is to be deleted. — Ver. 13. ἡττήθητε] B D* S* 17 have ἡσώθητε (so Lachm.), which is nothing but a copyist's error, and in D and S is rightly corrected ; F G have ἐλαττώθητε, which is a gloss. — Ver. 14. After τρίτον Griesb. Scholz, Lachm. Rück. Tisch. read τοῦτο, following doubtless a preponderance of authorities, among which, however, D E 93, Copt. Syr. ? put it *before* τρίτον. An addition from xiii. 1. — ὅμων] is wanting after καταναρκ. in A B S* 17, 71, *al.* Aeth. Damasc., while D* F G have ὁμῶς. Both have been supplied, and are rightly deleted by Lachm. Tisch. — Ver. 15. εἰ καί] καί is wanting in A B F G S* Copt. Sahid. Deleted by Lachm. An addition from misunderstanding ; see the exegetical remarks. — Ver. 19. πάλιν] Lachm. Tisch. and Rück. read πάλαι on preponderating evidence. Rightly ; the πάλαι not understood was erroneously glossed. — In what follows κατέναντι is to be adopted instead of κατενώπιον, with Lachm. and Rück., on preponderating evidence. Comp. ii. 17. — Ver. 20. Instead of of ἔρεις, Lachm. and Rück. read ἔρις, but against preponderating evidence. The latter might easily originate through itacism. Instead of ζῆλοι, Lachm. Tisch. and Rück. read ζῆλος, following A B D* F G, Goth. Syr. Arm. Dam. Rightly ; the plural crept in from the surrounding forms. — Ver. 21. ἐλθόντα με] Lachm. Rück. and Tisch. read ἐλθόντος μου, following A B F G S* 39, 93. Rightly ; the *Recepta* is a grammatical emendation, which brought with it the omission of the subsequent με. — ταπεινώση] Lachm. and Tisch. read ταπεινώσει, following B D E F G L, min. Oec. The subjunctive is a mechanical alteration in accordance with the preceding and usual form.

CONTENTS.—Breaking off from what precedes, Paul passes over to the revelations which he has had, narrates one of them, and says : Of this he would boast, not of himself, except only of his weaknesses ; for he will perpetrate no folly by self-glorying, but abstains from it, in order not to awaken too high an opinion of himself (vv. 1–6). And in order that he might not plume himself over those revelations, there was given to him a painful affliction, on account of which after a thrice-repeated invocation he had been referred by Christ to His grace ; hence he preferred to glory in his weaknesses, in order that he might experience the power of Christ, for which reason he had pleasure in his weaknesses (vv. 7–10). — He had become a fool, compelled thereto by them ; for he ought to have been commended by them, since in no respect did he stand behind the fancied apostles, but, on the contrary, had wrought amongst them the proofs of his apostolic dignity (vv. 11, 12). This leads him, amidst bitter irony, again to his gratuitous working, which he will continue also on his third arrival (vv. 13–15). But not only had he not by himself and immediately taken advantage of them, but not even through others mediately (vv. 16–18). Now begins the conclusion of the whole section : Not before them, but before God, does he vindicate himself, yet for their edification. For he fears that he may find them not in the frame of mind which he wishes, and that he may be found by them in a fashion not wished for (vv. 19–21).

Ver. 1.¹ Scarcely has Paul, in xi. 32 f., begun his *καυχᾶσθαι τὰ τῆς ἀσθενείας*

¹ See on ver. 1 ff., Beyschlag in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1864, p. 206 ff. ; Hilgenfeld in his *Zeitschr.* 1864, p. 173 ff. ; and again, Bey-

schlag in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1865, p. 217 ff. ; also Holsten, *zum Evang. des Paul. u. d. Petr.* 1868, p. 21 ff.

with the incident in Damascus, when he breaks off again with the thought which, in the instantaneous, true tact of his consciousness (comp. on xi. 32 f.), as it were bars his way : *καυχᾶσθαι δεῖ, οὐ συμφέρει μοι* (see the critical remarks) : *to boast of myself is necessary, not beneficial for me*. Let it be observed that *οὐ συμφ.* is the antithesis of *δεῖ* ; (*necesse, non utile est*), and that a comma only must therefore stand after *δεῖ* ; further, that *μοι* belongs not merely to *συμφ.*, but also to *δεῖ* (Tob. v. 14 ; Kühner, *ad Xen. Mem.* iii. 3. 10, *Anab.* iii. 4. 35 ; Mätzner, *ad Antiph.* p. 257) ;¹ lastly, that *συμφ.* means the *moral* benefit as opposed to the ethical disadvantage of the self-exaltation (comp. ver. 7, and see Theophyl.) : “saluberrimum animo ἡ τῆς οἰήσεως συστολή,” Grotius. Comp. Ignat. *Trall.* 4 : πολλὰ φρονῶ ἐν θεῷ, ἀλλ’ ἐμavτὸν μετρῶ, ἵνα μὴ ἐν καυχῇσιν ἀπόλωμαι. The *δεῖ* arose out of the existing circumstances of the Corinthians, by which Paul had seen himself necessitated to the *καυχᾶσθαι* ; but the *οὐ συμφέρει* prevails with him to pass on to something *else* and far *higher*, as that in which there lay *no self-glory* (ver. 5). With the reading *δὴ* (see the critical remarks) the *δὴ* would only make the notion of *καυχᾶσθαι* more significantly² prominent, like the German *eben* or *ja* [*certainly, or indeed*] (see Krüger, § 69, 19. 2 ; Klotz, *ad Devar.* p. 392 ; Baeumlein, *Partikell.* p. 98), but could not, as Hofmann (with an inappropriate appeal to Hartung) assumes, denote glorying “*simply and absolutely*,” in contrast with a *καυχᾶσθαι τὰ τῆς ἀσθενείας*. This Paul would have known how to express by something like *ἀπλῶς δὴ καυχᾶσθαι. — ἐλεύσομαι*] not : I *would* (to which Hofmann practically comes), but : I *will* (now) come to speak. See Wolf, *Curae* ; Dissen, *ad Pind. Ol.* ix. 83, p. 119. — γάρ] He might also have said *οὖν*, but his conception is, that by his passing over to something else the *οὐ συμφέρει μοι* is illustrated and confirmed. See Klotz, *ad Devar.* p. 235 ; Baeumlein, *Partik.* p. 86. — εἰς ὁπτασία καὶ ἀποκαλ. κυρίου] *i.e. to facts, in which Christ imparted to me visions and revelations*.³ The *genitivus subjecti* κυρίου is the characteristic definition, which *both* words need (not simply the *second*, to which Hofmann limits it). Theophylact remarks that in ἀποκαλ. there is added to ὁπτασ. something *more*, ἡ μὲν γὰρ

¹ Reiche (*Comment. crit.* I. p. 404) objects that Paul must have written “solenniter et perspicue :” *καυχᾶσθαι ἐμέ δεῖ, οὐ δὲ συμφέρει μοι*. But if *μοι* were not to be referred jointly to *δεῖ*, seeing that *δεῖ* with the dative and infinitive certainly is found in classical writers *seldom* (see also Ellendt, *Lex. Soph.* i. p. 399 f.), and *never* in the N. T., an *ἐμέ* would not be necessary : but *καυχ. δεῖ* may be taken absolutely : *boasting is necessary* (under the circumstances given), *not advantageous is it to me*. The non-use of *δέ* or *ἀλλά* is in keeping with the very common asyndetic juxtaposition of contrasted statements, 1 Cor. vii. 6 ; Rom. ii. 29 ; 2 Cor. v. 3, *et al.* Reiche himself, defending the *Recepta*, lays the whole emphasis on *μοι* : my boasting takes place not for *my own* advantage, but for yours (in order to correct your judgment regarding me, etc.). He explains

it, therefore, as if Paul had written : *οὐκ ἐμοί or οὐκ ἐμavτῷ συμφέρει*. Theodoret had already taken it erroneously, quite like Reiche.

² “Δέ est particula determinativa, id verbum, quod sequitur, graviter efferens,” Kühner, *ad Xen. Mem.* iii. 7. 2. Comp. also Hartung, *Partik.* I. p. 283. Erasm. : “gloriarī sane non expedit mihi.” It might accordingly be taken also with a touch of *irony*, like *scilicet* : *boast indeed I must*. See Stallbaum, *ad Plat. Symp.* p. 173 E ; Hartung, *l.c.* Holsten also, *l.c.* p. 28, takes it in the ironical sense.

³ As is well known, from this passage arose the apocryphal Ἀποκάλυψις Παύλου, and (or?) the Ἀναβατικὸν Παύλου. See Lücke-Einl. in d. *Offend. Joh.* I. p. 244 ff. ed. 2. Theophylact finds the proof that this treatise is not genuine in ἄρρητα, ver. 4.

μόνον βλέπειν δίδωσιν, αὕτη δὲ καὶ τι βαθύτερον τοῦ ὁρωμένου ἀπογυμνοῖ. This distinction, however, keeps the two ideas apart contrary to their nature, as if the apocalyptic element were not given with the ὁπτασία. Ὀπτασία ("species visibilis objecta vigilantī aut somniantī," Grotius) is rather a special form of receiving the ἀποκάλυψις (comp. Lücke, *Einl. in d. Offenb. Joh.* I. p. 27, ed. 2), which latter may take place by means of such a miraculous vision (Dan. ix. 23, x. 1, 16) ; see also Luke i. 22 ; Acts xxvi. 19. This is the meaning of ὁπτασία here, and ἀποκαλ. is a wider idea (inasmuch as revelations occur also otherwise than in the way of visions beheld, although here ensuing in that way ; comp. ver. 7, where ἀποκαλ. stands alone.—That Paul by what follows wishes to prove, with a polemic object against the Christine party, that *external* acquaintance with Christ was superfluous (so Baur ; see also Oecumenius), is not to be assumed, just because otherwise the mention of his having had a *vision of Christ* would be necessary for its bearing on the sequel. Nor can we from this passage infer it as *the* distinctive feature of the Christines, that they had claimed to stand by visions and revelations in a mystical connection with Christ (Schenkel, Dähne, de Wette, Goldhorn ; comp. also Ewald, Beyschlag), since Paul is contending against specifically *Judaistic* opponents, against whom he pursues his general purpose of elucidating his apostolic dignity, which enemies obscured in Corinth,¹ from the special distinctions which *he*, and not his opponents, had to show (comp. Rübiger, p. 210 ; Klöpper, p. 99 ff.). (x⁶)

Ver. 2. He now quotes *instar omnium* a single event of such a nature, specially memorable to him and probably unique in his experience, vv. 2–4. — οἶδα ἄνθρωπον κ.τ.λ.] *I know a man . . . who was snatched away.* Paul speaks of himself as of a third person, because he wishes to adduce something in which no part of the glory at all falls on the Ego proper. And how suitable in reality was the nature of such an event to the modest mode of representation, excluding all self-glory ! In that ecstasy the Ego had indeed really ceased to be the *subject of its own activity*, and had become quite the *object of the activity of others*, so that Paul in his usual condition came before himself as other than he had been in the ecstasy, and his *I*, considered from the standpoint of that ecstasy, appeared as a *he*. — ἐν Χριστῷ] a man *to be found in Christ* (as the element of life), 1 Cor. i. 30, a *Christian* ; not : "quod in Christo dico, i.e. quod sine ambitione dictum velim," Beza, connecting it with οἶδα (comp. Emmerling). — πρὸ ἐτῶν δεκατεσσάρων] belongs to ἀρπαγέντα, from which it is separated by the parenthesis. We may add that this note of time is already decisive against those, who *either* find in this incident the conversion of the apostle (or at least something connected therewith), as Damasus, Thomas, Lyra, L. Capellus, Grotius, Oeder, Keil, *Opusc.* p. 318 ff. ; Matthaei, *Religionsgl.* I. p. 610 ff., and others, including

¹ According to Hilgenfeld, Paul means now to impart yet something *greater* than the vision of Christ (?) at his call. Not something greater, but something quite of *another kind*. Holsten, too, finds in the ὁπτασίας something, which exalts Paul above the original apostles, since to the latter

such things had not been imparted after the resurrection of Christ. That, indeed, we do not at all know. We are acquainted with analogous disclosures also by Peter. And how scanty are our *sources* regarding the history of the Twelve !

Bretschneider and Reiche, and quite recently Stölting, *Beitr. z. Exeg. d. Paul. Br.* 1869, p. 173—or identify it with the appearance in the temple, Acts xxii. 17 ff., as Calvin (but uncertainly), Spanheim, Lightfoot, J. Capellus, Rinck, Schrader, and others ; comp. also Schott, *Erört.* p. 100 ff. ; Wurm in the *Tüb. Zeitschr.* 1833, 1, p. 41 ff. ; Wieseler, p. 165, and *on Gal.* p. 591 ff. ; Osiander. The conversion was *upwards of twenty* years earlier than this Epistle (see on Acts, Introd. § 4). See, besides, Estius and Fritzsche, *Diss.* I. p. 58 ff. ; Anger, *rat. temp.* p. 164 ff. In fact, even if the definition of the time of this event could be reconciled with that of the *appearance in the temple*, Acts xxii. 17 ff., still the narrative of this passage (see especially ver. 4 : ἤκουσεν ἄρρητα κ.τ.λ.) is at any rate so essentially different from that in Acts xxii., that the identity is not to be assumed.¹ The connection which Wieseler assumes with the Damascene history does not exist in reality (comp. on xi. 32 f.), but with xii. 1 there begins something *new*. The event here mentioned, which belongs in point of time to the stay at Antioch or to the end of the stay at Tarsus (Acts xi. 25), is to us *quite unknown otherwise*. The *reason*, however, why Paul added the *definition of time* is, according to Chrysostom, Pelagius, Theodoret, and others, given thus : “videmus Paulum ipsum per annos quatuordecim tacuisse, nec verbum fuisse facturum, nisi importunitas malignorum coëgisset,” Calvin. But how purely arbitrary ! And whence is it known that he had been so long silent regarding the ecstasy ? No ; the specification of time flowed without special design just as naturally from the pre-eminently remarkable character which the event had for Paul, as from the mode of the representation, according to which he speaks of himself as of a third person, in whose case the notice of an already long past suggested itself spontaneously ; for “*longo tempore alius a se ipso quisque factus videtur*” (Bengel). — εἴτε ἐν σώματι] *sc.* ἡρπάγη from what follows. Regarding εἴτε . . . εἴτε, *whether . . . or*, see Hartung, *Partikell.* II. p. 202 f. also Dissen, *ad Dem. de Cor.* p. 224. He puts the two cases as *quite equal* as respects possibility, not the first as more probable ; hence with the second εἴτε no καί is added ; see Dissen. In that ecstasy his lower consciousness had so utterly fallen into abeyance, that he could not afterwards tell (according to Athan. *c. Ar.* Serm. 4 : *dared not tell*) whether this had taken place by means of a temporary withdrawal of his spirit out of the body, or whether his whole person, the body included (ἐν σώματι), had been snatched away. By this alternative he expresses simply the utter *incomprehensibleness* for him of the manner of the occurrence. It is to him as if either the one or the other had taken place, but he knows neither the former nor the latter ; hence he is not to be made responsible for the possibility or eventual mode of the one or other. “Ignoratio *modi* non tollit certam *rei* scientiam,” Bengel. Following Augustine, *Genes. ad lit.* xii. 5, Thomas and Estius explained ἐν σώματι : *anima in corpore manente*, so that Paul would say that he does not know whether it took place in a vision (ἐν σώματι) or by an

¹ According to Wieseler, the ἄρρητα ῥήματα were the *preparatory basis* for the delegation of the apostle in Acts xxii. 18, 21. But there is no hint of this in either text. And

the revelation laying the basis for his vocation among the Gentiles had been received by Paul much earlier than the appearance in the temple, Gal. i. 15.

actual snatching away of the spirit (ἐκτὸς τοῦ σ.). But if he had been uncertain, and had wished to represent himself as uncertain, whether the matter were only a seeing and perceiving by means of the spiritual senses or a *real snatching away*, it would not have had at all the great importance which it is held to have in the context, and he would only have exposed to his rivals a weak point, seeing that inward visions of the supernatural, although in the form of divinely presented apparitions, had not the *quite extraordinary character* which Paul manifestly wishes to ascribe to the event described. This also in opposition to Beyschlag, 1864, p. 207, who explains the alternative εἴτε ἐν σώματι only as the bestowal of a marvellous “range” and “reach” of the inward senses—in spite of the ἀρπαγέντα. Moreover, we must not ascribe to the apostle the Rabbinical opinion (in Schoettgen, *Hor.* p. 697) that he who is caught into paradise puts off his body and is clothed with an ethereal body ; because otherwise he could not have put the case εἴτε ἐν σώματι.¹ So much, however, is clear, that for such a divine purpose he held as possible a temporary miraculous withdrawal of the spirit from the body without death.² The *mode*³ in which this conceived possibility was to take place must be left undetermined, and is not to be brought under the point of view of the separability of the bare πνεῦμα (without the ψυχή) from the body (Osiander) ; for spirit and soul form inseparably the *Ego* even in the trichotomistic expression of 1 Thess. v. 23, as likewise Heb. iv. 12 (see Lünemann *in loc.*). Comp. also Calovius against Cameron. Hence also it is not to be said with Lactantius : “abit *animus*, manet *anima*.”—The anarthrous ἐν σώματι means *bodily*, and that his own body was meant by it, and τοῦ σώματος with the article is not anything different, was obvious of itself to the reader ; σῶμα did not *need* the article, Stallbaum, *ad Plat. Phaed.* p. 83 C. — ἀρπαγέντα] the stated word used of sudden, involuntary raptures. See Acts viii. 39 ; Rev. xii. 5 ; 1 Thess. iv. 17. The form of the 2d aorist belongs to the deteriorated Greek. See Thomas Mag. p. 424 ; Buttmann, I. p. 381. — τὸν τοιοῦτον] summing up again (Kühner, II. p. 330) : *such an one*, with whom it was so. Comp. 1 Cor. v. 5. — ἕως τρίτου οὐρ.] thus, through the first and second heaven into the third.⁴ As the conception of several heavens pervades the whole of the O. and N. T. (see especially, Eph. iv. 10 ; Heb. iv. 14) ; as the Rabbins almost unanimously (Rabbi Juda assumed only two) reckon *seven* heavens (see the many passages in Wetstein, Schoettgen, *Hor.* p. 718 ff. ; comp. also Eisenmenger, *Entdeckt. Judenth.* I. p. 460 ; Hahn, *Theol. d. N.T.* I. p. 247) ; and as Paul here names a definite number,

¹ Just as little is the case put to be made conceivable as a *momentary transfiguration* of the body (Osiander). The bodily transfiguration is simply an *eschatological* event (1 Cor. xv. 51 ff. ; 1 Thess. iv. 17), and a transformation of such a nature, that *after it* the return to the previous condition is quite inconceivable.

² Comp. the passage already quoted in Wetstein from Philo, *de Somn.* I. p. 626, where Moses ἀσώματος γινόμενος is said to

have fasted forty days.

³ The remark of Delitzsch in this connection : “because what is experienced *compresses itself, after the fashion of eternity, into a moment*” (*Psychol.* p. 357), is to me obscure and too strange to make it conceivable by me.

⁴ In Lucian, *Philopatr.* 12, Christ (Γαλιλαῖος) is mocked at as εἰς τρίτον οὐρανὸν ἀκροβατήσας καὶ τὰ κάλλιστα ἐκμεμαθηκώς.

without the doctrine of only three heavens occurring elsewhere ; as he also in ver. 4 specifies yet a higher locality situated beyond the third heaven : it is quite arbitrary to deny that he had the conception of seven heavens, as was done by Origen, *contra Celsum*, vi. p. 289 : ἑπτὰ δὲ οὐρανούς, ἡ ὅλως περιορισμένον ἀριθμὸν αὐτῶν, αἱ φερόμεναι ἐν ταῖς ἑκκλησίαις οὐκ ἀπαγγέλλουσι γραφαί. (x^o) The rationalistic explanations of more recent expositors, such as that of Billroth (following Schoettgen) : that he only meant by this figurative (?) expression to express the nearness in which his spirit found itself to God, have as little exegetical warrant as the explanation of Calvin, Calovius, and others, that the holy number *three* stands κατ' ἐξοχήν *pro summo et perfectissimo*, so that τρίτου denotes "the highest and most perfect sphere of the higher world" (Osiander) ;¹ or as the assertion of others (Estius, Clericus, Bengel, and others), that it is a *doctrine of Scripture* that there are only three heavens (the heaven of clouds, the heaven of stars, and the empyrean ; according to Damascenus, Thomas, Cornelius à Lapide, and others, "coelum sidereum, crystallinum, empyreum ;" according to Grotius : "regio nubifera, reg. astrifera, reg. angelifera"), or the fiction of Grotius and Emmerling, that the *Jews* at that time had assumed only these three heavens. It is true that, according to the Rabbins, the *third* heaven was still no very exalted region.² But we do not know at all *what* conception of the difference of the seven heavens Paul followed (see below), and are therefore not at all justified in conjecturing, with Rückert, in opposition to the number seven, that Paul was not following the usual hypothesis, but another, according to which the third heaven was at least one of the higher ;³ but see on ver. 4, where a still *further* ascent from the third heaven into paradise is mentioned. Even de Wette finds the usual view most probable, that by the third heaven is meant the *highest* ; "in such things belonging to pious fancy nothing was established until the Rabbinical tradition became fixed." But the third heaven must have been to the readers a well-known and already established conception ; hence we are the less entitled to depart from the historically attested number seven, and to adopt the number three (nowhere attested among the Jews) which became current in the church only on the basis of this passage (Suicer, *Thes.* II. p. 251), while still in the *Test. XII. Patr.* (belonging to the second century) p. 546 f., the number seven holds its ground, and the seven heavens are exactly described, as also the *Ascensio Jesaiae* (belonging to the third century) has still this conception of Jewish gnosis (see Lücke, *Einl. in d. Offenb. Joh.* I. p. 287 f., ed. 2). How Paul conceived to himself the several heavens as *differing*, we cannot determine,

¹ The old Lutherans, in the interests of the doctrine of ubiquity, maintained that the third heaven and paradise denote "*statum potius alterius saeculi quam locum*," Hunnius.

² The Rabbinical division was different, e.g. (1) *velum* ; (2) *expansum* ; (3) *nubes* ; (4) *habitaculum* ; (5) *habitatio* ; (6) *sedes fixa* ; (7) *Araboth* or ταμεῖον. Others divide in other ways. See Wetstein.

³ Rückert appeals to the fact that R. Juda assumed only *two* heavens. But this isolated departure from the usual Rabbinical type of doctrine cannot have any application here, where a *third* heaven is named. Passages would rather have to be shown, in which the number of heavens was assumed to be under seven and above two. In the absence of such passages, Rückert's conjecture is groundless.

especially as in those Apocryphal books and among the Rabbins the statements on the point are very divergent. Erroneously, because the conception of several heavens is an historical one, Hofmann (comp. also his *Schriftbeweis*, II. 1, p. 535) has regarded *ἕως τρίτου οὐρανοῦ* as belonging to the *vision*, not to the *conception* (in connection with which he lays stress on the absence of the article), and spiritualizes the definite concrete utterance to this effect, that Paul in the vision, which made visible to him in a spiritual manner the invisible, “*saw himself caught away beyond the lower domains of the supermundane and up into a higher region.*” This is to depart from the clear literal meaning and to lose oneself in generalities. It is quite unwarranted to adduce the absence of the article with *τρίτον*, since with ordinal numbers the article is not at all required, Matt. xx. 3 ; Mark xv. 25 ; Acts ii. 15, xxiii. 23 ; John i. 40 ; Thuc. ii. 70. 5 ; Xen. *Anab.* iii. 6. 1 ; Lucian, *Alex.* 18 ; 1 Sam. iv. 7 ; Susann. 15 ; see Kühner, *ad Xen. Anab.* vii. 7. 35 ; Nägelsbach on the *Iliad*, p. 292, ed. 3.

Vv. 3, 4. *And I know such a man . . . that he, namely, was caught away, etc.* The expression is here the well-known attraction *οἰδά σε τίς ἐστι*. Most expositors consider the *matter itself* as not different from what is mentioned in ver. 2, so that *τρίτος οὐρανός* and *ὁ παράδεισος* would be one and the same. But it is decisive against this view, that *ὁ τρίτος οὐρανός* cannot without arbitrariness be taken otherwise than of a region of heaven comparatively low (see on ver. 2). Besides, the whole circumstantial repetition, only with a change in designating the place, would not be solemn language, but battology. This also in opposition to Hofmann, who imports the modification : “The one time emphasis is laid only on the *surroundings*, into which he found himself transported away from the *earth* ; the other time on the contrast of the *fellowship of God*, into which he was transported away from the *church of God here below.*” Clemens Alexandrinus, Irenaeus, Origen, Athanasius, and several Fathers and schoolmen (see Estius and Bengel on the passage), also Erasmus¹ and Bengel², have rightly *distinguished* paradise from the third heaven. Comp. also Hahn, *Theol. d. N. T.* I. p. 246 ; Osian-der, Hilgenfeld, and others. Still we are not, with Bengel (comp. de Wette), to regard (see on ver. 2) paradise as *interius quiddam in coelo tertio, quam ipsum coelum tertium* (comp. Cornelius à Lapide) ; but Paul relates first how he was caught up into the third heaven, and then adds, as a further point in the experience, that he was transported further, higher up into paradise, so that the *ἕως τρίτου οὐρανοῦ* was a break, as it were, a resting-point of the *raptus*. Thus, too, the repetition of the same words, as well as the repetition of the parenthesis, obtains its solemn character ; for the incident is reported *step by step, i.e.* in two stages.—*The paradise* is here not the *lower, i.e.* the place in *Sheol*, in which the spirits of the departed

¹ “Raptus est in tertium usque coelum, hinc rursum in paradisum,” Erasmus in his *Paraphr.* Comp. Clemens Alex. : *ἕως τρίτου οὐρανοῦ, καὶ κεῖθεν εἰς παράδεισον* (*Strom.* v. p. 427).

² Who as to the repetition of the same

words judges very rightly : “Non solum suaviter suspendunt acnuntque lectorem, et gloriationi consideratae pondus addunt, sed etiam plane duplex rei momentum expriment.”

righteous are until the resurrection (see on Luke xvi. 23, xxiii. 43), nor as Hofmann, *Schriftbew.* II. 1, p. 489, substitutes in place of this historical conception the abstraction: "the present communion of the blessed dead with God, as it is on this side of the end of things;" but the *upper*, the paradise of God (Rev. ii. 7; Enoch xxv. 1) in heaven, where God's dwelling is. This distinction is one given historically, and necessary for the understanding of the passage, and is rightly maintained also by Osiander, Hahn, and others. Comp. the Rabbinical passages in Eisenmenger, *entdeckt. Judenth.* I. 296 ff., and generally, Thilo, *ad Ev. Nic.* 25, p. 748 ff.; Gfrörer, *Jahrh. d. Heils*, II. p. 42 ff. The idea, however, that Christ has carried the believing souls out of Hades with Him to heaven (Delitzsch, *Psychol.* p. 414) goes beyond Scripture, and is not presupposed even in this passage. — ἀρρήτα ῥήματα] an oxymoron: ¹ *dicta nefanda dictu, speakings, which may not be spoken* (Dem. 1369. 25, 1370. 14; Soph. *O. R.* 465; Eur. *Hel.* 1370; and Pflugk *in loc.*), *i.e.* which may not be made the subject of communication to others. The revelations which Paul received were so sublime and holy, that the further communication of them would have been at variance with their character; what was disclosed to him was to be for him alone, for his special enlightenment, strengthening, comforting, with a view to the fulfilment of his great task; to others it was to remain a mystery, in order to preclude fanatical or other misuse; comp. Calvin. That ἀρρήτα here does not mean *quae dici nequeunt* (Plato, *Soph.* p. 238 C), as Beza, Estius, Calovius, Wolf, and many others, including Billroth and Olshausen, hold (Rückert is not decided), is shown by the solemn epexegetical ἀ οὐκ ἐξὸν ἀνθρώπῳ λαλῆσαι. in which ἐξὸν means *licet, fas est*, and is not—as Luther and many older and later commentators, including Billroth and Olshausen, wish to take it, quite at variance with the signification of the word—equivalent to δύνατον. The Vulgate aptly renders: "et audivit arcana verba, quae non *licet* homini loqui," *i.e.* which a man may not utter aloud. Lucian, *Epigr.* 11 (Jacobs, *Del. epigr.* VII. 66): ἀρρήτων ἐπέων γλώσση σφρηγὶς ἐπικείμεθω, Soph. *El.* 1000, *Aj.* 213. Comp. Rev. x. 3 f. — ἀνθρώπῳ] for they are reserved only for *divine* communication; a *man*, to whom they are revealed, may not utter them. (z⁶)—As to *what it was* that Paul heard for himself, the Fathers and schoolmen made many conjectures after their fashion. See Cornelius à Lapide and Estius. Theodoret well says: αὐτὸς οἶδεν ὁ πάντα τεθεαμένος.² From *whom* as the organ of communication he heard it, remains veiled in apocalyptic indefiniteness. Revealing *voices* (comp. Rev. *l.c.*) he did hear.

Ver. 5. *On behalf of the one so constituted I will boast, but on behalf of myself, etc.* Paul *abides* by his representation begun in ver. 2, according to which he speaks of himself as of a *third* person. The reader understood him! to the effect, namely, that apart from that difference of persons under-

¹ See regarding similar juxtapositions in general, Lobeck, *Paralip.* p. 229 f. Comp. plat. *Conv.* p. 189 B: ἀρρήτα ἔστω τὰ εἰρημένα, Soph. *Oed. Col.* 1005: ῥητὸν ἀρρήτον, *Aj.* 213: λόγον ἀρρήτον.

² It is most natural (comp. the Apocalypse)

to think of disclosures *regarding the end of the world*, which however, must have gone further than what occurs in the Epistles of the apostle (as 1 Thess. iv.; 1 Cor. xv.; Rom. xi. 25 f.). More definite statements (see Ewald) must be left in abeyance.

lying the mere representation, the essential meaning of ὑπὲρ τοῦ τοιούτου καυχῆσθαι was the same as if Paul had written : τὸ τοιοῦτο (or ἐν τῷ τοιούτῳ) καυχῆσθαι. But this may not mislead us, with Luther, Mosheim, Zachariae, Heumann, Schulz, Rosenmüller, Rückert, to take τοιούτου as *neuter*; for in favour of the view that it is *masculine* (so after Chrysostom, most expositors, including Flatt, Fritzsche, Billroth, Olshausen, de Wette, Ewald, Osiander, Hofmann) we may decisively urge not merely τὸν τοιοῦτην, vv. 2 and 3, as well as the personal contrast in ἐμᾶντοῦ, and the otherwise marred symmetry of the whole mode of representation (see Fritzsche, *Diss.* II. 124), but also ὑπέρ, which with καυχᾶσθαι denotes the *person* for whose *advantage* (see on v. 12), not simply *in regard to* whom (Hofmann), the boast is made; the *thing* is afterwards by ἐν expressly distinguished from the person. The objection of Rückert, that Paul might not push the conception so far! is quite invalid, since, in fact, the readers, if they once knew that from ver. 2 onward he meant *himself*, could not at all misunderstand him. — εἰ μὴ is not for ἐὰν μὴ (Rückert), but it introduces an actually existing exception to that principle¹ ὑπὲρ ἐμᾶντοῦ οὐ καυχῆσθαι. It is, however, neither necessary nor justifiable to supply with ὑπ. ἐμ. οὐ καυχ. : “of the visions and revelations which I have had,” so that εἰ μὴ would form an inexact contrast (de Wette), since Paul, quite in harmony with xi. 30, absolutely denies that he wishes to boast *on behalf of his own self* otherwise than only of his weaknesses (comp. xi. 30). Self-glorying otherwise is only then to take place on his part, when his own Ego (his work, toil, merit, etc.) does not come at all into consideration, but he is merely the dependent, receptive instrument of the Lord, and appears as a *third person*, on behalf of whom the καυχᾶσθαι takes place. The *plural* ἄσθεν. denotes the various situations and manifestations, in which his feebleness presents itself. (A⁷)

Ver. 6. Γάρ] is not *indeed* or *however* (Flatt and others), nor are we, with Rückert, to supply a μέν after ἐάν; but the thought, for which γάρ assigns the reason, is—by a frequent usage very natural with the lively train of thought (see especially, Hartung, *Partikell.* I. p. 464 ff.; Baeumlein, *Partik.* p. 83 f.)—as resulting of itself, not expressly set forth; it is implied in the οὐ καυχῆσθαι εἰ μὴ κ.τ.λ., in so far as these words presuppose that Paul *could* boast, if he *would*. In reference to this he continues : *for in case I possibly shall have wished*, etc. Comp. Winer, p. 422 [E. T. 568]. Osiander wrongly refers γάρ to the *first* half of ver. 5; for the second half contains the leading thought and the progressive point of the passage. According to Ewald, Paul means the time of *judgment*, when he shall wish really to glory, whereas now he refrains. In this case he must have subsequently at least written νῦν δὲ φείδομαι in order to be understood, and even then the reference of the θελήσω to the day of judgment, in the absence of any express designation of the latter, would only be very indirectly indicated. — ἐάν] does not stand for *kān* any more than at x. 8 (in opposition to Rückert). — οὐκ ἔσομαι ἄφρων] glancing back to xi. 1, 16 ff., but spoken now in entire

¹ Καυχῆσθαι, namely, expresses a principle to be followed, not as Grotius and

others would take it: “Futurum pro potentiali . . . gaudere et exultare possem.”

seriousness, expressing the folly of the vaunting *which injures the truth*. — *φείδομαι δέ*] sc. τοῦ *καυχᾶσθαι*, i.e. *but I keep it back*, make no use of it. Comp. Xen. *Cyr.* i. 6, 35, iv. 6. 19 ; Soph. *Aj.* 115 ; Pind. *Nem.* ix. 20. 47 ; LXX. Job xxxiii. 18 ; Wisd. i. 11 ; Dissen, *ad Pind.* p. 488 ; Porson, *ad Eur. Or.* 387. — *μή τις εἰς ἐμὲ λογίσηται κ.τ.λ.*] Purpose of the *φείδομαι δέ* : *in order that no one may judge in reference to me beyond that, as which he sees me* (i.e. *supra id quod vidit esse me*, Beza), or *what he possibly hears from me* (out of my mouth, i.e. *in order that no one may form a higher opinion of me than is suggested to him by his being eye-witness of my actions, or by his being, it may be, an ear-witness of my oral ministry*. Many in Corinth found his action powerless and his speech contemptible (x. 10) ; but he wished still to call forth no higher judgment of himself than one *consonant to experience*, which could not but spontaneously form itself ; hence he abstains from the *καυχᾶσθαι*, although he would speak the truth with it. On *λογίσηται*, comp. xi. 5 ; Phil. iii. 13 ; 1 Cor. iv. 1, *al.* Ewald takes it ; *in order that no one may put to my account*. This, however, would be expressed by *μή τις ἐμοὶ λογίσ.* — The *τί* (*possibly*) is to be explained as a condensed expression : *si quid quando audit*. See Fritzsche, *Diss.* II. p. 124 ; Schaefer, *ad Dem.* IV. p. 232 ; Bremi, *ad Aesch.* II. p. 122 f. On *ἐξ ἐμοῦ*, comp. Herod. iii. 62, and the Latin *audio ex* or *de aliquo*. See Madvig, *ad Cic. Fin.* p. 865.

Ver. 7. *καί*] is the simple copula, not *even* (Fritzsche). The course of thought, namely, is : For this reason I abstain from *καυχᾶσθαι* (ver. 6), and —to return now to what I said in vv. 1–5—as concerns those revelations which I, though without self-glorying, leave not unmentioned (ver. 5), care is taken of this, that I do not vaunt myself on this distinction. — *τῇ ὑπερβολῇ τῶν ἀποκαλ.*] *Dativus instrumenti* : because the revelations imparted to me have a character so exceeding,—a nature transcending so utterly all the bounds of what is ordinary. The *order of the words* is inverted, in order to make the whole attention of the reader dwell on *τῇ ὑπερβ. τ. ἀποκαλ.*, to which the discourse here returns.¹ Comp. ii. 4 ; Gal. ii. 10, *al.* See on Rom. xi. 31. — *ἐδόθη μοι σκόλοψ τῇ σαρκὶ κ.τ.λ.*] “*Ex alto habuit revelationem, ex profundo castigationem*,” Bengel. It is not to be connected so as also to take in *ἵνα ἄγγελος Σατ. με κολαφ.* (Knapp), nor is *σκόλοψ* to be con-

¹ Lachmann, who has adopted *διό* before *ἵνα* (see the critical remarks), puts the whole of ver. 6, *ἐὰν . . . ἐξ ἐμοῦ*, in a parenthesis, and places a full stop after *ἀποκαλύψεων* in ver. 7, so that *κ. τῇ ὑπερβ. τ. ἀποκαλ.* goes with *εἰ μὴ ἐν ταῖς ἀσθενείαις* (Lachmann has struck out *μου*, but on too slender authority) in ver. 5, and *διὸ ἵνα μὴ ὑπεραίρωμαι* begins a new sentence. But in that case not only would *καὶ τῇ ὑπερβολῇ τῶν ἀποκαλ.* come in haltingly after a very isolated and, as it were, forlorn fashion, but Paul would have given to the parenthesis and illogical position. Logically he must have written : *ὑπὲρ δὲ ἑμαντοῦ οὐ καυχῆσομαι* (*ἐὰν γὰρ θελήσω καυχῆσασθαι . . . ἐξ ἐμοῦ*) *εἰ μὴ ἐν ταῖς ἀσθενείαις καὶ τῇ ὑπερβολῇ*

τῶν ἀποκαλύψεων. Ewald follows Lachmann's reading, but, not assuming any parenthesis, attaches *καὶ τῇ ὑπερβ. τῶν ἀποκαλ.* to *μή τις εἰς ἐμὲ λογίσηται κ.τ.λ.*, and that in the sense : *even by these abundant disclosures led astray*, if I should express myself, namely, as to their contents. But apart from the consideration that Paul would have expressed such a sense too unintelligibly by the mere dative and without more precise definition, utterances regarding the contents of the *ἀποκαλύψεις*, had he made them, would have fallen within the category of what is denoted by *ἣ ἀκούει τὶ ἐξ ἐμοῦ*, and consequently in so far the logical accuracy of *μή τις εἰς ἐμὲ λογ. κ.τ.λ.* would fail.

sidered as a prefixed apposition, and ἄγγελος Σατ. as subject (Tertullian, and probably also Chrysostom, see Fritzsche, *Diss.* II. p. 127). For it may be urged against the *former*, that an inappropriate relation of meaning would result from it ; and against the *latter*, which Hofmann has again preferred, that there is no reason whatever for departing from the usual order of the words, since even with it the ἵνα με κολαφ. applies to the angel of Satan. The *ordinary* construction isto be retained as the simplest and most natural ; according to this, ἄγγελος Σατ. appears as an appositional more precise definition of σκόλοψ τῇ σαρκί : *there was given to me a thorn for my flesh, an angel of Satan.*—ἐδόθη] by whom ? The *usual* answer, given also by Rückert, Olshausen (“the educating grace of God”), Ewald, is : *by God*. See especially, Augustine, *de nat. et grat.* 27 : “Neque enim diabolus agebat, ne magnitudine revelationum Paulus extolleretur, et ut virtus ejus proficeretur, sed Deus.” Ab illo igitur traditus erat justus colaphizandus angelo Satanae, qui per eum tradebat et injustos ipsi Satanae.” Certainly ἵνα μὴ ὑπεραίρωμαι is the purpose not of the devil, but of the divine will, without which the suffering in question inflicted by the devil on the apostle could not affect him ; but just because the latter has thought of the devil as the one from whom that suffering proceeded, he must have conceived him also as the *giver*, because otherwise his mode of representation would be self-contradictory. Doubtless Satan is only the *mediate* giver,¹ who thereby is to serve the divine final aim ἵνα μὴ ὑπαίρ. ; but the explanation, that Paul had wished to say (?) that God had *permitted* (so also Chrysostom and Theophylact) Satan to torment him (Billroth) is a quite arbitrary alteration of what Paul *actually* says. His meaning is rather, and that expressed in an *active* form : Satan has given to me a thorn for the flesh, in order to torment me with it—which has the moral aim ordained in the divine counsel, that I should not vaunt myself.—σκόλοψ] only here in the N. T. It may mean *stake*, ξύλον ὀξύ, Hesychius (Homer, *Il.* viii. 343, xv. 1, xviii. 177 ; Herod. ix. 97 ; Xen. *Anab.* v. 2. 5), but also *thorn* (Lucian, *Merc. cond.* 3 ; LXX. Hos. ii. 6 ; Ezek. xxviii. 24 ; Num. xxxiii. 55 ; Eccles. xliii. 19, and Fritzsche *in loc.*, Dioscor. in Wetstein), as, indeed, it may also denote anything pointed, splinters, ridges, etc. The Vulgate has *stimulus*. It is here *commonly* taken as *stake*, many, like Luther, thinking of a penal stake.² Comp. σκολοπίζω, impale, ἀνασκολοπίζω, Herod. i. 128. But as the conception of a *stake* fixed in his flesh has something exaggerated and out of keeping about it, and as the figurative conception of a *thorn* pressed into the flesh with acute pain might very naturally occur to him from the LXX. (Num. xxxiii. 55 ; Ezek. xxviii. 24), the latter signification is to be preferred. Comp. Artem. iii. 33 : ἀκανθαὶ καὶ σκόλοπεσ ὀδύνας σημαίνουσι διὰ τὸ ὀξύ. —τῇ σαρκί is most naturally attached to σκόλοψ as an *appropriating dative* (comp. Castalio) : *a thorn for the flesh*, which is destined to torment that sensuous part of my nature which lusts to sin (*in specie*, to self-exaltation). Fritzsche, who, with

¹ Comp. Hofmann : “an evil which befalls him in accordance with God’s will, but through the working of a spiritual power opposed to God.”

² In the gloss : “It is a stake, where people are impaled, or crucified, or hanged.”

Winer, Osiander, and Buttmann, takes τῇ σαρκί as defining more precisely the part of μοι (see as to the σχῆμα καθ' ὅλον καὶ μέρος, more used by the poets, Nägelsbach on the *Il.* ii. 171, iii. 438 ; Reisig, *ad. Oed. Col.* 266 ; Jacobs, *Delect. Epigr.* p. 162, 509 ; Kühner, II. p. 145), objects that τῇ σαρκί seems inappropriate, because it is inconceivable that a σκόλοψ should torment the soul, and not the body. But this objection would apply, in fact, to Fritzsche's own explanation, and cannot at all hold good, partly because it is certainly possible to think figuratively of a σκόλοψ tormenting the soul (see Artemid. *l.c.*, where, among the figurative references of ἀκανθαὶ κ. σκόλοποι, he also adduces : καὶ φρόντιδας καὶ λύπας διὰ τὸ τραχύ), partly because σάρξ does not denote the body *absolutely*, or only according to its *susceptibility* (Hofmann), *but according to its sinful quality* which is bound up with the σάρξ. The objection, on the other hand, that *salutary torment* is not the business of an angel of *Satan* (Hofmann), leaves out of consideration the divine teleology in the case ; comp. on 1 Cor. v. 5. — ἄγγελος Σατᾶν] Paul considers his evil, denoted by σκόλοψ τ. σ., as inflicted on him by Satan, the enemy of the Messiah, as in the N. T. generally the devil appears as the originator of all wickedness and all evil, especially also of bodily evil (Hahn, *Theol. d. N. T.* I. p. 372 f. ; Weiss, *bibl. Theol.* p. 462). By the addition of ἄγγελος Σατ. in apposition to σκόλοψ τ. σ. the σκόλοψ is *personified*, and what is an ἔργον of Satan appears now, under the apostle's vivid, concrete mode of view, an *angel* of Satan. The interpretation which takes the indeclinable Σατᾶν,¹ occurring only here in the N. T. (see, however, LXX. 1 Kings xi. 14, 23, 25 ; Aq. Job i. 6), as the *genitive*, is the usual and right one. For if Σατᾶν be taken as a *nominative*, it must either be a *nomen proprium* : the *angel Satan* (Billroth), or it would have to be taken adjectivally : a *hostile angel* (Cajetan and others, including Flatt). But the latter is against the standing usage of the N. T., into which ἰϞϞ has passed only as a *nomen proprium*. Against the former no doubt Fritzsche's reason is not decisive : “sic neminem relinqui, qui ablegare Satanam potuerit” (comp. Rückert), since Satan in his original nature was an angel, and might retain that appellation without the point of view of the sending coming further into consideration ; nor can we, with Olshausen, urge the absence of the article, since ἄγγ. Σατ. might have assumed the nature of a proper name ; but the *actual usage* is against it, for Satan, so often as he occurs in the N. T., is never named ἄγγελος (Rev. ix. 11 is not to the point here, see Düsterdieck *in loc.*), which was a very natural result of the altered position of the devil, who, from being an ἄγγελος before, had become the *prince* (Eph. ii. 2) of his kingdom, and now had angels of his own (Matt. xxv. 41, comp. Barnab. 18). — ἵνα με κολαφίζῃ] design of the giver in ἐδόθη μοι κ.τ.λ. : *in order that he may buffet me* (Matt. xxvi. 67 ; 1 Cor. iv. 11 ; 1 Pet. ii. 20). The *present* denotes the still subsisting continuance of the suffering. See Theophyl. : οὐχ ἵνα ἅπαξ με κολαφίσῃ, ἀλλ' αἰεὶ. Comp. Chrysostom. The *subject* is ἄγγελος Σατᾶν, as indeed often the continuation of the discourse attaches itself to

¹ Σατανᾶ, read by Lachmann and Rückert on the authority of Δ* B D* F G S* 67**, is a correct interpretation.

the apposition, not to the subject proper. See Fritzsche, *Diss.* II. p. 143 f. Fritzsche himself, indeed, regards *σκόλοψ* as the subject,¹ and assumes that the vivid conception of the apostle has transferred to the subject what properly belongs only to the apposition, to which view he had been moved by the similar sound of *σκόλοψ* and *κολαφίζη*, as well as by the personification of *σκόλοψ*. But how easily might he have found a word which would have suited the conception of the personified *σκόλοψ*, and would not have been inappropriate to the apposition *ἄγγ. Σατ.* ! But in fact he has chosen a word which does *not* suit *σκόλοψ* at all, and suits *ἄγγ. Σατ.* *exclusively*, and hence we are not warranted in denying that the word belongs to *ἄγγ. Σατ.* Besides, this connection is most naturally suggested by the relations of the sense ; for only by *ἵνα με κολαφ.* does *ἄγγ. Σατ.* come to be a *complete* apposition to *σκόλοψ τ. σ.*, inasmuch as the *element of pain* in the case expressed in *σκόλοψ τ. σ.* is not yet implied in the mere *ἄγγ. Σατᾶν*, but is only added by *ἵνα με κολαφ.* — *ἵνα μὴ ὑπεραίρωμαι*] paedagogic aim of God's guidance in this *κολαφίζειν*. See above. The devil and his angels serve, against their intention, the intention of God. See Hahn, *Theol. d. N. T.* I. p. 382 f. In the repetition of the same words there is expressed the deeply felt importance of this telic destination. See Heindorf, *ad Phaed.* p. 51 ff. ; Matthiae, p. 1541. Comp. also Bornemann, *Schol. in loc.* p. xxxix. — Lastly, as concerning the thing itself, which Paul denotes by *σκόλοψ τ. σ. κ.τ.λ.*, it was certainly known by the Corinthians from their personal acquaintance with Paul without any more precise indication ; to us at least any special indication has been denied. For a great host of attempts at explanation, some of them very odd, see Poole's *Synopsis* ; Calovius, *Bibl. ill.* p. 518 ff. ; Wolf, *Cur.* The opinions are in the main of three kinds : (1) that Paul means *spiritual assaults of the devil* (what are called *injectiones Satanae*), who suggested to him blasphemous thoughts (Gerson, Luther, Calovius), stings of conscience over his earlier life (Luc. Osiander, Mosheim ; also Osiander, who includes also a bodily suffering), and the like. The *Catholics*, however, to whom such an exposition, favouring forms of monastic temptation, could not but be welcome, thought usually of *enticements* of Satan (awakened, according to Cardinal Hugo, by association with the beautiful Thecla !) ² to *unchastity* (Thomas, Lyra, Bellarmine, Estius, Cornelius à Lapide, and many others, and still Bisping), for which Augustine and Theophylact are often wrongly quoted as vouchers. (2) That Paul means the *temptations on the part of his opponents* ³ engaged in the service of Satan (xi. 13, 15), or the *temptations and troubles of his apostolic office in general* (Theodoret, Pelagius, Erasmus, Beza, Calvin, and many others, including Fritzsche, Schrader, Reiche, *Comm. crit.* p. 401). (3) That Paul means a very severe *bodily*

¹ Comp. Augustine, *Conc. 2 in Ps. lviii.* : " *Accepit apost. stimulum carnis, a quo colaphizaretur.*"

² See, regarding this mythical association, the *Acta Pauli et Theclae* in Tischend. *Act. apocr.* p. 40 ff.

³ So Chrysostom and others. Many among these, because of the singular, think

specially of one pre-eminently hostile antagonist. So, among the ancient expositors, Oecumenius, and, among the modern, several cited by Wolf, and also Semler and Stolz. Chrysostom and Theophylact name, by way of example, the smith Alexander, Hymenaeus, and Philetus.

suffering (Augustine and many others, including Delitzsch and Hofmann), in connection with which conjecture has lighted on a variety of ailments, such as hypochondriac *melancholy* (Bartholinus, Wedel, and others), *pain in the head* (τίνες already in Chrysostom, Theophylact, Pelagius, Occumenius, and Jerome, *ad Gal.* iv. 14, mention it ; so also Teller), *haemorrhoids* (Bertholdt), “*falling sickness* or something similar” (Ewald, Hofmann), *epileptic attacks of cramp* (Ziegler, Holsten), and several others. — Against No. 1 we cannot urge τῇ σαρκί, since the devil’s influence would have, in operating on the moral consciousness, to start certainly from the σάρξ, where the principle of sin has its seat (Rom. vii.), but we may urge σκόλοψ and ἵνα με κολαφ., figurative expressions which evidently portray an acute and severe pain. Besides, under such a constant spiritual influence of the devil, Paul would not appear in a manner in keeping with his nature wholly filled by Christ (see especially, Gal. ii. 20), and with his pneumatic heroism. Enticements to unchastity are not even to be remotely thought of on account of 1 Cor. vii. 7 ; it would be an outrage on the great apostle. Against No. 2 it is to be remarked that here a suffering *quite peculiar* must be meant, as a counterpoise to the quite peculiar distinction which had accrued to him by the ὑπερβολὴ τῶν ἀποκαλύψεων. Besides, adversaries and official troubles belonged necessarily to his calling (see especially, iv. 7 ff., vi. 4 ff.), as, indeed, he had these in common with *all* true preachers of Christ, and knew how to find an honour in them (comp. Gal. vi. 17) ; hence he would certainly not have besought the taking away of *these* sufferings, ver. 8. It is believed, no doubt, that this explanation may be shown to suit the context by ver. 9 compared with ver. 10 (see especially, Fritzsche, p. 152 f.), but ἀσθένεια in vv. 9 and 10 expresses only the *category*, to which also that special suffering belonged. Accordingly No. 3 remains at all events as the most probable, namely, the hypothesis *that Paul bore in his person some kind of painful, chronic bodily evil*, which seemed to him as inflicted by Satan.¹ Only this evil cannot at all be specified more precisely than that it made itself felt in its paroxysms by shocks of pain, which might be compared to blows ; but in what part of the body it had its seat (possibly proceeding from the head) cannot with certainty be inferred from κολαφίζειν, since this word, like the more correct Greek κονδυλίζειν, denotes buffeting with the fist. More specific conjectures are mere fancies, are liable to be enlisted in the service of *tendency-criticism* (Holsten, who attaches to this suffering the disposition to visionary conditions), and come to some extent into sharp collision with the fact of the apostle’s extraordinary activity and perseverance amid bodily hardships. The hypothesis of a bodily suffering, with the renunciation of any attempt to specify it more precisely, is rightly adhered to, after older expositors, by Emmerling, Olshausen, Rückert, de Wette, Beyschlag, *et al.*

¹ In this respect, too, we find a parallel in the history and mode of view of Luther, who, as is well known, suffered from violent attacks of stone (which visited him with especial severity on the Convention at Schmalkald), and likewise ascribed this suffering to the devil as its author.—Chrys-

ostom exclaims against the view of a bodily evil (κεφαλαλγία): μὴ γένοιτο· οὐ γὰρ ἂν τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Παύλου ταῖς τοῦ διαβόλου χερσὶν ἐξεδόθη, ὅπου γε αὐτὸς ὁ διάβολος ἐπιτάγματι μόνον εἶκεν αὐτῷ Παύλῳ. An argument *nimium probans!*

(though Rückert here also appeals to the alleged traces of sickness in our Epistles, such as 1 Cor. ii. 2, 2 Cor. iv. 12, as well as to Gal. iv. 13-15); while *others*, as Neander and Billroth, content themselves with an utter *non liquet*, although the former is inclined to think of inward temptations.¹

Vv. 8, 9. Ὑπὲρ τούτου] *in reference to whom*, namely, to this angel of Satan. That τούτου is *masculine* (comp. ver. 3), not neuter (Vulgate, Luther, Flatt, Osiander, and others), is evident from the fact that ἵνα ἀποστῇ ἀπ' ἐμοῦ follows without any other subject. On the latter, comp. Luke iv. 13; Acts v. 38, xxii. 29. — τρίς] is taken since Chrysostom's time by many as equivalent to πολλάκις; but quite arbitrarily, and not at all in keeping with the *small* number! No; Paul relates *historically*, as it really happened, leaving it withal undetermined what intervals had elapsed between these invocations. At his first and second appeal to the Lord no answer was made; but when he had made a third appeal, the answer came. And that he thereupon did not entreat again, was understood of itself from his faithful devotion to Him, whose utterance he had now received. According to Billroth, τρίς is intended to intimate a thrice-repeated *succumbing to that pain*, a thrice-repeated utter dejection, which, however, is sheer fancy. — τὸν κύριον] not *God* (Calvin, Neander, and others), but *Christ* (see ver. 9), who is, in fact, the heavenly advancer of His kingdom and mighty vanquisher of Satan.² — εἰρηκέ μοι] The *perfect*, which Rückert finds surprising, is what is quite commonly used of the continued subsistence of what has been done: *he has spoken*, and I have now this utterance abidingly valid. (B⁷) Accordingly the evil itself is to be regarded as still adhering to the apostle. *How* he received the answer, the χρηματισμός (Matt. ii. 12; Luke ii. 6; Acts x. 22), from Christ (by some kind of inward speaking, or by means of a vision, as Holsten holds), is entirely unknown to us. — ἀρκεῖ σοι ἡ χάρις μου) *there suffices for thee my grace*, more thou needest not from me than that I am gracious to thee. In this is implied the *refusal* of the prayer, but at the same time what a comforting *affirmation*! “Gratia esse potest, etiam ubi maximus doloris sensus est,” Bengel. Rückert (comp. Grotius) takes χάρις quite generally as *good-will*; but the good-will of the exalted Christ is, in fact, *always* grace (comp. xiii. 13; Acts xv. 11; Rom. v. 15), and made itself known especially in the apostle's consciousness as grace, 1 Cor. xv. 8, 9, and often. A *special* gift of grace, however (Chrysostom: the gift of miracles), is arbitrarily imported. — ἡ γὰρ δύναμις μου κ.τ.λ.] *for my strength is in weakness perfected*. The emphasis lies on δύναμις: “Thou hast enough in my grace; for I am not weak and powerless, when there is suffering weakness on the part of the man to whom I am gracious, but *exactly* under these circumstances are *my power and strength* brought to perfection, *i.e.* effective in full measure.” Then, namely, the divine δύναμις of Christ has unhindered scope, not disturbed or limited by any admixture of selfish striving and working.

¹ The most strange interpretation of the passage is given by Redslob in the *Progr. d. Hamb. Gymnas.* 1860, who goes so far as to make out of it a jesting designation of *Silvanus* (סלני, Ezek. xxviii. 24)!

² The invocation of Christ has reference also here to the intercessory work of the Lord. Comp. on Rom. x. 12; Rich. Schmidt, *Paul. Christol.* p. 127 f.

The relation is similar in 1 Cor. ii. 4 f. Comp. 2 Cor. iv. 7. With the reading without *μου* (see the critical remarks), which Hofmann too prefers, there would result the quite general proposition : “for power there attains to its full efficacy, where weakness serves it as the means of its self-exertion” (as Hofmann puts it)—a proposition, which is only true when the *δύναμις* is *different* from the ability of the weak subject, and can work with all the less hindrance amidst the powerlessness of the latter. Hence, for the truth of the proposition and in keeping with the context (comp. ver. 9), the specification of the subject for *ἡ δύναμις* cannot at all be dispensed with. — *ἡδιστα ὂν μᾶλλον καυχῆσομαι κ.τ.λ.*] the altered tone proceeding from that answer of Christ. Grotius¹ and others, including Emmerling, join *μᾶλλον* with *ἡδιστα*, although *μᾶλλον* is used to heighten the *comparative*, but not the superlative (see on vii. 13). Estius (comp. previously, Erasmus) finds in *μᾶλλον* : “magis ac potius, quam in ulla alia re, qua videar excellere ;” Bengel and Billroth : *ἡ ἐν ταῖς ἀποκαλύψεσιν* ; Rückert : more than of what I can (my talents and performances) ; comp. also Ewald. But against all this is the consideration that Paul must have written : *μᾶλλον ἐν ταῖς ἀσθενείαις μου καυχῆσομαι*. As the text stands, *μᾶλλον* belongs necessarily to *καυχῆσομαι* (comp. vii. 7), not to its object. And the *reference* of *μᾶλλον* is furnished by the context. Previously, namely, Paul had stated how he had prayed the Lord to take away his suffering. Now, however, after mentioning the answer received, he says : With the utmost willingness (*maxima cum voluptate*, comp. ver. 15) therefore will I, encouraged by the word of the Lord which I have, *only all the more* (comp. on vii. 7) *glory* in my weaknesses ; *all the more boldly* will I now *triumph* in my states of suffering, which exhibit me in my weakness ; comp. Rom. v. 3, viii. 35 ff. More than would have been otherwise the case, is the courage of the *καυχᾶσθαι ἐν ταῖς ἀσθενείαις* *increased* in him by that utterance of the Lord. (c⁷) — *ἵνα ἐπισκηνώσῃ κ.τ.λ.*] Aim of the *μᾶλλον καυχῆσομαι κ.τ.λ.* And the Lord’s answer itself has, in fact, placed this goal before his eyes, and assured him of his reaching it. The *ἐπ’ ἐμέ* is conceived of as : *may take its abode on me, i.e.* may come down before me and unite itself with me for abiding protection, comfort, strengthening, etc.² The choice of the word *ἐπισκην.* leads us to conclude that he has conceived of the case as analogous to the *Shechinah* (comp. on John i. 14, xiv. 23). The direction *from above downward* is not withal implied in *ἐπί* by itself, which rather indicates direction in general (comp. Polyb. iv. 18. 8 : *ἐπισκηνοῦν ἐπὶ τὰς οἰκίας*, to go into quarters in the houses), but is given in the context. Comp. Ps. civ. 12. (c⁷)

Ver. 10. *Διό*] because, namely, in such circumstances with such a mood the power of Christ joins itself with me. — *εὐδοκῶ ἐν ἀσθεν.*] *I take pleasure in weaknesses*, bear them with inward assent and willingly, when they befall me. Comp. vii. 4. “Contumax enim adversus tormenta fides,” Tacitus, *Hist.* i. 3 ; Seneca, *de prov.* iv. 4. *ἀσθ.* are here, as in the whole context, situations of human powerlessness, brought about by allotted experiences of

¹ Grotius and Emmerling expressly, but many others, as also Flatt and Olshausen, tacitly, by leaving *μᾶλλον* untranslated.

² That is the holy *ἐνδυναμοῦσθαι* by means

of Christ to the *ισχύειν πάντα*. (Phil. iv. 13) in its forms of ever-renewed heightening and exaltation (Phil. iv. 16). Comp. 2 Cor. vi. 4 ff. ; Rom. viii. 37 ff.

suffering. Afterwards four, partly more, partly less, special kinds of such situations are adduced. Rückert, quite at variance with the context, understands *diseases* to be meant. — ἐν ὑβρεσιν] passive : *in cases of arrogant treatment*, which I experience. On the *plural*, comp. Plato, *Legg.* i. p. 627 A ; Dem. 522. 13 ; Ecclus. x. 8. They bring into *necessities* (ἀναγκ.) ; and persecutions drive into *straitened positions* (στενοχ.), out of which no issue is apparent (comp. on iv. 8). — ὑπὲρ Χριστοῦ] belongs neither to all five elements (so usually), nor simply to the last four points (Hofmann) but to εὐδοκῶ : *for Christ's sake*, because by such sufferings His honour and His work are promoted. That Paul meant *sufferings for Christ*, was, indeed, self-evident. But he wishes to assign the *specific motive* for his εὐδοκῶ. — τότε δύνατός εἰμι] inwardly through Christ's power. See vv. 8, 9. τότε, *then*, is emphatic, here with the feeling of *victoriousness*. Comp. 1 Cor. xv. 54 ; Col. iii. 4 ; Hom. *Il.* xi. 191 f., 206 f. ; Plato, *Phil.* p. 17 D, *Conv.* p. 192 B. On the *idea*, comp. the expression of Moses in Philo, *Vit. M.* 1, p. 613 B : τὸ ἀσθενὲς ὑμῶν δυνάμεις ἐστίν.

Ver. 11. Paul now comes to a stand, and surveys how much he has said in commendation of himself from chap. xi. onward. This retrospect extorts from him the *admission* : γέγονα ἄφρων, but as respects its contents he at once proceeds to justify himself, and to impute the blame to the readers. It is not to be taken either *as a question* or in the sense of a *hypothetical protasis* (Hofmann gives a choice between the two). The ὑμεῖς κ.τ.λ., asyndetic, but all the more striking, gives no ground for such a weakening of the meaning. — γέγονα ἄφρων] *ironical* exclamation ; for it is clear from xi. 16, xii. 6, that Paul did not really regard his apologetic *καυχᾶσθαι* hitherto as a work of folly. But the opponents took it so ! In the emphatically prefixed γέγονα (comp. v. 17) there is implied : *it has come to pass that I am a fool !* This now subsists as accomplished fact ! “Receptui canit,” Bengel. — ὑμεῖς με ἠναγκάσατε ἐγὼ γὰρ κ.τ.λ.] This justifies him and blames the *Corinthians* for that γέγονα ἄφρ. The emphatic ὑμεῖς, and afterwards the ἐγώ, the emphasis of which Rückert failed to perceive, correspond to each other significantly : *you* have compelled me ; for *I* had a claim to be commended *by you*, instead of commending myself. The stress is on ὑφ' ὑμῶν, next to the ἐγώ, in which there is a side-glance at the pseudo-apostles, boastful themselves, and boasted of by their partisans. — οὐδὲν γὰρ ὑστέρησα κ.τ.λ.] Reason assigned for ἐγὼ ὠφελον. See, moreover, on xi. 5. The *aorist* refers to the time of his working at Corinth. The negative form of expression is a pointed litotes. — εἰ καὶ οὐδὲν εἰμι] although I am quite without value and without importance. The same humility as in 1 Cor. xv. 8–10. But how fraught with shame for the opposing party, with which those false apostles were of so great account ! And in this way the significant weight of this *closing* concessive clause is stronger and more telling than if it were attached as *protasis* to *what follows* (Hofmann). It is more *striking*. — In regard to οὐδὲν εἶναι, see on 1 Cor. xiii. 2 ; Gal. vi. 3.

Ver. 12. Proof of the previous οὐδὲν ὑστέρησα τῶν ὑπερλ. ἀποστ. : *The signs, indeed* (yet without producing among you the due recognition) *of the apostle*

were wrought among you. The μέν *solitarium* leaves it to the reader to supply for himself the corresponding contrast, so that it may be translated by our *truly, indeed*. See especially, Baeumlein, *Partik.* p. 163 ; Maetzner, *ad Antiph.* p. 153 ; Kühner, *ad Xen. Anab.* i. 2. 1. The contrast to be supplied *here* is put beyond doubt by the idea of the σημεῖα which is placed emphatically and significantly at the head ; hence we must reject what Billroth (followed by Olshausen) supplies ; *but even otherwise you can make no complaint about anything*. — τὰ σημεῖα τοῦ ἀποστ. is that which divinely evinces the apostle to be such, that by which one discerns *the apostle*. Ὁ ἀπόστολος with the article does not denote the *ideal of an apostle* (Billroth), which would be at variance with his humility, but the apostle *in abstracto*. Bengel says aptly : “ ejus, qui sit apostolus.” — κατειργάσθη ἐν ὑμῖν] namely, which I was with you. The *I*, however, retreats modestly behind the passive expression. The compound “ *perficere* notat maxime rem arduam factuque difficilem,” Fritzsche, *ad Rom.* I. p. 107. — ἐν πάσῃ ὑπομονῇ] the manner of the κατειργάσθη ἐν ὑμῖν, strengthening the force of the proof : *in all manner of perseverance*, so that amidst adverse and painful circumstances there was perseverance with all possible steadfastness in fully exhibiting these signs of an apostle. The view followed by many older expositors since Chrysostom : “ *primum signum* nominat patientiam,” is erroneous, since the ὑπομονή is not a specifically *apostolic* σημεῖον.¹ — σημείοις κ. τέρασι καὶ δυνάμεσι] whereby those signs of an apostle were accomplished, so that σημείοις is here meant in a narrower sense (*miraculous* signs) than the previous τὰ σημεῖα. The three words in emphatic accumulation denote the same thing under the two different relations of its miraculous *significance* (σημ. κ. τέρ.) and of its *nature* (δύν. deeds of power, 1 Cor. xii. 10). Comp. 2 Thess. ii. 9 ; Heb. ii. 4 ; Acts ii. 22. The notions of σημεῖα and τέρατα are equivalent. See on Rom. xv. 19. — Paul therefore wrought miracles also in Corinth, and wrought them as *credentials of his apostleship* (Heb. ii. 4). Comp. Rom. xv. 19 ; Acts xv. 12. — On the accumulation of terms, comp. Cic. *Tusc.* ii. 40. 26 : “ His ego pluribus nominibus unam rem declarari volo, sed utor, *ut quam maxime significem*, pluribus.” Comp. also Cic. *de Fin.* iii. 4. 14 ; *Nat. D.* ii. 7. 18. — How at variance with our passage is the historical criticism, which lays down *a priori* the negation of miracles ! (D⁷)

Ver. 13. τί γάρ ἐστιν . . . ὑμῶν] Bitterly ironical justification of what was said in ver. 12. *For what is there, in which you were placed at a disadvantage towards the other churches* (in which I wrought), *except*, etc. ? that is to say : for in nothing have you come behind, as compared with the other churches, except, etc. Quite arbitrarily Grotius limits this question, which embraces the whole blissful apostolic working, to the *communication of gifts by the laying on of hands*. — ὑπέρ] means nothing else than *beyond*, but in the direction downward (reference to the *minus*) which ἡττήθητε specifies. Comp. Winer, p. 376 [E. T. 502]. Rückert, overlooking the comparative sense of ἡττήθητε, says : there is here an ironical confession that all churches had disadvantage

¹ An appeal should not have been made to vi. 4, where in fact there stands the wider conception θεοῦ διάκονοι.

from Paul, and it is only denied that the disadvantage of the Corinthian was greater than that of the other churches. This would not suit at all as *assigning a reason* for ver. 12. In assigning a reason, Paul could not but say: *ye have in nothing come off worse*; but to say, *for your disadvantage has not been greater*, would, with all its irony, be inappropriate. On the *accusative* of more precise definition with ἡττήθητε, comp. Xen. *Cyr.* i. 4. 5 : ἀ ἡττήτο. The more usual construction is ᾧ or ἐν ᾧ. — εἰ μὴ ὅτι κ.τ.λ.] In this exception (“specie exceptionis firmat quod dicit,” Grotius) lies the painful bitterness of the passage, which in the request that follows χάρισασθε κ.τ.λ. becomes still sharper. It is the love, deeply hurt in its pure consciousness, that speaks. — αὐτὸς ἐγώ] *I myself*; this places his *own person* over against the apostolic *services* indicated in τί . . . ἡττήθητε. Comp. in general on Rom. ix. 3. Rückert (so also Bengel) holds that Paul has already had in his mind what he subjoins in vv. 16–18. Such an arbitrary prolepsis of the reference is the more untenable, seeing that with vv. 14, 15 another train of ideas intervenes. — οὐ κατενάρκησα ὑμῶν] See on xi. 8. Only by the fact *that he has not been burdensome* to them in accepting payment and the like, has Paul asserted himself as an apostle less among them than among the other churches ! For this *injustice* they are to *pardon* him !

Ver. 14. After that cutting irony comes the language of paternal earnestness, inasmuch as Paul once more (comp. xi. 9–12) assures them that even on his impending third arrival among them he will remain true to his principle of not burdening them, and explains why he will do so. — ἰδοὺ] vivid realizing of the position in the changing play of emotion. — τρίτον] emphatically prefixed, belongs to ἐλθεῖν πρὸς ὑμᾶς (comp. xiii. 1), not to ἐτοίμως ἔχω, as Beza, Grotius, Estius, Emmerling, Flatt, and others, also Baur (in the *Theol. Jahrb.* 1850, 2, p. 139 ff.), Lange, *Apost. Zeitalt.* I. p. 200 f., would have it,¹ since, according to the context, it was not on his third *readiness* to come that anything depended, but on the third *arrival*, for only as *having arrived* could he be burdensome to the readers. Comp. the *Introd.*, and see Bleek in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1830, p. 614 ff.; Neander, I. p. 414; Anger, *Rat. temp.* p. 71; Wieseler, *Chronol. d. ap. Zeitalt.* p. 233. Chrysostom aptly says : καὶ δεύτερον παρεγενόμην καὶ τρίτον τοῦτο παρεσκεύασμαι ἐλθεῖν, καὶ οὐ καταναρκήσω ὑμῶν. — οὐ γὰρ ζητῶ κ.τ.λ.] *for my endeavour is not directed to yours, but to you*; you yourselves (your ψυχαί, ver. 15)—namely, that I may win you for the salvation in Christ (Matt. xviii. 15; 1 Cor. ix. 19)—are the aim of my striving. “Dictum vere apostolicum,” Grotius. Comp. Cic. *de Fin.* ii. 26 : “Me igitur ipsum ames oportet, non mea, si veri amici futuri sumus.” Comp. also Phil. iv. 17. — οὐ γὰρ ὀφείλει κ.τ.λ.] Confirmation of the principle previously expressed, from a rule of the natural rightful relations between parents and children; for Paul was indeed the spiritual *father* of the Corinthians (1 Cor. iv. 15). The negative part of this confirmation corresponds to οὐ ζητῶ τὰ ὑμῶν, and the positive to the ὑμᾶς; for, while Paul ζητεῖ αὐτούς (not τὰ αὐτῶν), he is the father, who gathers for his children treasures, namely, the blessings of the Messianic kingdom. — οἱ γονεῖς] *sc.*

¹ See also Märcker, *Stellung d. Pastoralbr.*, Meiningen 1861, p. 13 f.

ὀφείλουσι θησανρίζειν, not as Beza holds : θησανρίζουσι ; for ὀφείλει is not impersonal. That by the first half of the verse, moreover, the duty of children in love to support and provide for their parents is not excluded, is clear from the very θησανρίζειν, and is just as obvious of itself as that in the second part the θησανρίζειν is not to be urged as a duty of parents (1 Tim. v. 8), but always has merely its relative obligation, subordinate to the higher spiritual care (Matt. vi. 33, vv. 19-21 ; Eph. vi. 4 ; Mark viii. 36).

Ver. 15. Paul applies what was said generally in ver. 14 : οὐ γὰρ ὀφείλει κ.τ.λ. to *himself* (ἐγώ, *I on my part* : *I, however, will very willingly spend and be spent for the good of your souls*, in order, namely, to prepare them for the salvation of eternal life (Heb. x. 39, xiii. 17 ; 1 Pet. i. 9 ; Jas. i. 21). Theodoret rightly says : ἐγὼ δὲ τῶν φύσει πατέρων καὶ πλεον τι ποιεῖν ἐπαγγέλλομαι. — For examples of δαπανᾶν (ἐκ strengthens, Polyb. xxv. 8. 4, xxi. 8. 9, xvii. 11. 10) used of the *life*, see Kypke, II. p. 272. On the subject-matter, comp. Horace, *Od.* i. 12. 38 f. : “animaeque magnae prodigum Paullum.” — εἰ περισσοτ. ὑμᾶς ἀγαπῶν ἥττον ἀγαπῶμαι] εἰ does not stand for εἰ καί (which is read by Elzevir and Tischendorf), for which Rückert takes it, but is the simple *if*, and that not even in the sense of ἐπεὶ or ὅτι, as it is used “ne quid confidentius, directius affirmetur” (Dissen, *ad Dem. de Cor.* p. 195), but, as is here most in keeping with tender delicacy in the expression of a harsh thought, in the purely hypothetical sense : *if*, which I leave undecided, etc. *In view of the possible case, that* he finds the less love among his readers, the more he loves them (this is implied in the mutual reference of the two comparatives, see Matthiae, § 455, Rem. 7),¹ the apostle will most gladly sacrifice his own (what he has from others, or even by his own work) and himself (comp. Rom. ix. 3 ; Phil. ii. 17) for their souls, in order that thus he may do his utmost to overcome this supposed—and possibly existing—disproportion between his loving and being loved by stimulating and increasing the latter (Rom. xii. 21 ; 1 Cor. xiii. 4-7). Hofmann, not observing the clever turn of the hypothetical expression of the thought, without reason finds this view absurd, and with sufficient crudeness and clumsiness takes εἰ to ἀγαπῶμαι as an independent *question*, to which Paul himself makes answer with ἔστω δέ (in the sense : *be it so withal*, I will let it rest there). To this interrogative view Hofmann ought all the less to have resorted, seeing that interrogation in such an indirect form (Winer, p. 474 [E. T. 639], and see on Matt. xii. 10 ; Luke xiii. 23) is wholly without example in Paul, often as he has had an opportunity for using it. It is found often in Luke, more rarely in Matthew and Mark. Except in the writings of these three, the N. T. does not present that independent use of the indirectly interrogative εἰ.

Vv. 16-18. Refutation of the possible slander, which assuredly was also actually ventured on the part of his adversaries, that, if he had not himself directly burdened the Corinthians, he had still done so in a cunning way indirectly by means of his emissaries. — In ver. 16 Paul does not, indeed, speak in the *person* of his opponents, for otherwise, instead of ἐγώ, he must

¹ In opposition to Hofmann, who, not attending to the correspondence of the

two comparatives, supplies with περισσ. : *than others*, and with ἥττον : *than by others*.

have expressed himself in the *third* person ; but he clothes his speech in the words of his adversaries.¹ (E⁷) — ἔστω δέ] concessive : *but be it so*, it may, however, be the case that *I* have not oppressed you. Comp. Plat. Gorg. p. 516 C, *al.* (Krüger, § 54, 4. 2) ; also the εἰεν, very common in classical writers, Stallbaum, *ad Plat. Euthyph.* p. 13 D ; Reisig, *ad Qed. Col.* 1303, and for the similar use of the Latin *esto, sit ita sane*, Cicero, *Tusc.* i. 43. 102 ; *De Fin.* iv. 45. — ἐγώ] my own person. — ἀλλ' ὑπάρχων κ.τ.λ.] no longer depends on ἔστω δέ, but is the contrast—to be read as an exclamation—of ἔστω δέ, ἐγὼ οὐ κατεβάρ. ὑμᾶς : *but cunningly I*, etc. — δόλω] This would have been the case, if he had made plunder of them indirectly by a third hand. — ἔλαβον] *caught*, figure taken from hunting. See on xi. 20. Comp. on δόλω λαμβάν. Soph. *Phil.* 101, 107, 1266. — Vv. 17 and 18 now show in lively questions, appealing to the reader's own experience, how untrue that ἀλλ' ὑπάρχων . . . ἔλαβον was. *Have I then overreached you by one of those whom I sent to you?* namely, by claims for money, and the like. The construction is *anacoluthic*, inasmuch as Paul, for emphasis, prefixes absolutely the *τινα ὧν ἀπέσταλκα πρὸς ὑμᾶς* as the object of what he wishes to say, and then subjoins the further statement independently of it, so that the accusative remains the more emphatically *pendent*—a usage found also in classical writers. See Bernhardt, p. 133. — ὧν] τούτων οὗς. Comp. Rom. xv. 18. — In ver. 18 he now mentions, by way of example, *Titus*, whom he had encouraged to travel to Corinth, and his fellow-envoy, and he asks, significantly repeating ἐπλεονέκτ. and prefixing it : *Has Titus overreached you?* This journey of Titus to Corinth is not, as is otherwise usually supposed, the one mentioned in chap. viii., which had yet to be made, and in which Titus had *two* companions (viii. 18, 22), but the one made soon after our first Epistle, and mentioned in chap. vii. The fact that Titus only is here mentioned, and not also Timothy (1 Cor. iv. 17, xvi. 10), is made use of to support the opinion that Timothy had not come to Corinth at all (see the *Introd.*). Comp. Rück. pp. 380, 409. But how groundlessly ! From the long and close connection of the apostle with the Corinthians it may be even *à priori* concluded, that he had sent various persons to Corinth beside Titus ; and he himself testifies this by the plural ὧν ἀπέσταλκα. But here he names only Titus *instar omnium* as the one *last* sent. Besides, it would not have been even proper to say : I have sent Timothy to you, since Timothy, in fact, was *joint-sender of the letter* (i. 1). — τὸν ἀδελφόν] *the brother* (fellow-Christian) *well known* to them (but unknown to us).² That in that mission he was quite *subordinate* to Titus is clear from συναπέστ., and from the fact that in what follows the conduct of *Titus* alone is spoken of. — τῷ αὐτῷ πνεύμ.] *with the same Spirit*, namely, with the *Holy Spirit* determining our walk and excluding all πλεονεξία. The *dative* is that of *manner* to the question *how?* Comp. Acts ix. 31, xxi. 21 ; Rom. xiii. 13. It may, however, also be just as fitly taken as *dative* of the *norm* (Gal. v. 16,

¹ Let us conceive that they had asserted regarding Paul : ἔστω δέ· αὐτὸς οὐ κατεβάρησεν ὑμᾶς κ.τ.λ. This Paul makes use of, inasmuch as he, entering into their meaning, says *of himself*, what *they* have said *of him*—a

mimesis, which is almost a parody.

² According to Wieseler, *Chronol.* p. 349, it was *Tychicus*, as also at viii. 22. This rests on a combination drawn from Titus iii. 12.

vi. 16). We cannot decide the point. If the *inward* agreement is denoted by τῷ αὐτῷ πνευμ., the likeness of *outward* procedure is expressed by τοῖς αὐτοῖς ἵχνεσι (comp. Plat. *Phaed.* p. 276 D : τῷ ταὐτὸν ἵχνος μετιόντι). But here the dative is *local*, as in Acts xiv. 16 ; Jude 11 (comp. Fritzsche, *ad Rom.* I. p. 225 f.). So Pind. *Pyth.* x. 20 : ἐμβέβακεν ἵχνεσιν πατρός, comp. with *Nem.* vi. 27 : ἵχνεσιν ἐν Πραξιδάμαντος ἐὸν πόδα νέμων. Whose are the footsteps, in which the two walked ? The footsteps of *Paul* in which Titus followed his predecessor (comp. Lucian, *Herm.* 73), so that they thereby became *the same*, in which *both* walked — said with reference to the unselfishness maintained by both. The context does not yield any reference to *Christ* (1 Pet. ii. 21).

Ver. 19. His vindication itself is now concluded. But in order that he may not appear, by thus answering for himself, to install the readers as judges over him, he further guards his apostolic dignity against this risk. Carrying them *in mediam rem*, he says : *For long you have been thinking that we are answering for ourselves to you !* Comp. 1 Cor. iv. 3. Correction of this opinion : *Before God we speak in Christ ; it is God* in presence of whom (as Judge) we speak in Christ's fellowship (as the element in which we subsist and live). ἐν X. gives to λαλοῦμεν its definite Christian character (which, with Paul, was at the same time the apostolic one). Comp. ii. 17. But, that he may not suppress the proper relation of his apology to the readers, he adds lovingly : *but the whole, beloved, (we speak) for your edification, for the perfecting of your Christian life.* — πάλαι δοκεῖτε ὅτι ὑμῖν ἀπολογ.] After adopting the reading πάλαι (see the critical remarks) this sentence is no longer to be taken *interrogatively*, because otherwise an unsuitable emphasis would be laid on πάλαι. Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Rückert have also deleted the mark of interrogation. πάλαι means nothing else than *for a long time*, in which, however, the past to be thought of may be very short according to the relative nature of the notion of time, as *e.g.* Hom. *Od.* xx. 293 f. : μοῖραν μὲν δὴ ξεῖνος ἔχει πάλαι, ὥς ἐπέοικεν, ἴσῃν, Plat. *Gorg.* p. 456 A ; *Phaed.* p. 63 D, *al.* ; see Stallbaum, *ad Plat. Apol.* p. 18 B ; Xen. *Anab.* iv. 8. 14, iv. 5. 5 ; Ellendt, *Lex. Soph.* II. p. 481. So also the Latin *dudum, jamdudum*. Here the meaning is, that the readers are *already for long, during the continuation of this apology*, remaining of opinion, etc. As respects the connection with the *present*, see further, Plato, *Phaedr.* p. 273 C ; Xen. *Anab.* vii. 6. 37. There exists no reason for attaching πάλαι to ver. 18 (Hofmann, then taking δοκεῖτε *interrogatively*), and it would, standing after ἵχνεσι, come in after a tame and dragging fashion, while it would have had its fitting position between οὐ and τῷ αὐτῷ. — ὑμῖν] Dative of destination. Comp. Acts xix. 33 ; Plato, *Protag.* p. 359 D ; *Pol.* x. p. 607 B. *Vobis*, i.e. *vobis judicibus*, has here the *chief emphasis*, which Rückert has aptly vindicated. The earlier expositors, not recognizing this, have accordingly not hit on the purpose and meaning of the passage ; as still Billroth : “It might seem that he wished to recommend himself” (comp. iii. 1, v. 12). To this his answer is : “I speak before God in Christ, i.e. my sentiments in what I say are not selfish, but upright and pure.” Comp. Chrysostom, Erasmus, Beza, Calvin, Grotius. — κατέναντι τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν Χρ. λαλοῦμεν] to be taken togeth-

er,¹ as in ii. 17. — τὰ δὲ πάντα] *sc.* λαλοῦμεν. Grotius and others, including Griesbach, Scholz, Olshausen, and Ewald, read τάδε as one word, and connect it with the previous λαλοῦμεν. But for what end? The mode of expression in the usual way of writing it is quite Pauline, and makes the important thought more emphatically prominent; ὅδε never occurs with Paul, and the reference of τάδε to what goes before would at least not be in accordance with the common usage (comp. on Luke x. 39). (F⁷)

Ver. 20 f.² Subjective justification of what was just said, ὑπὲρ τῆς ὑμῶν οἰκοδομῆς. For I fear to find you on my arrival such as have very great need of οἰκοδομή. — The sharp lesson which he now gives his readers down to xiii. 10, although introducing it not without tenderness to their feelings (φοβοῦμαι, and then the negative form of expression), could not but wholly cancel the thought: ἡμῖν ἀπολογεῖται, and make them feel his apostolic position afresh in all its ascendancy. It is in this way that the victor speaks who has reconquered his domain, and *this* language at the end of the letter completes the mastery shown in its well-calculated arrangement. — καὶ γὰρ εὑρεθῶ ὑμῖν κ.τ.λ.] *and that I shall be found such an one as you do not wish*, namely, as τιμωρὸς καὶ κολαστῆς, Theophylact; 1 Cor. iv. 21. The negation attaches itself to οἶον in the first clause, but in this second to θέλετε, by which there is produced a climax in the expression. — ὑμῖν] Reference of εὑρεθῶ: *for you, to your judgment based on experience.* Comp. Rom. vii. 10; 2 Pet. iii. 14. This is more delicate and expressive than the meaning of the common interpretation: *by you* (dative with the passive), Rom. x. 20. — What follows is not, with Rückert, to be regarded as if μήπως down to ἀκαταστασίαι were a more precise explanation regarding *the condition of the Corinthians* (consequently regarding that μήπως ἐλθὼν οὐχ οἶον θέλω εὔρω ὑμᾶς), and, ver. 21, a more precise explanation regarding *the apostle's duty to punish* (consequently regarding that καὶ γὰρ . . . θέλετε). Against this it may be decisively urged that ver. 21 brings forward quite a different category of sinful states from ver. 20, and that ver. 21, rightly understood, does not yet express any threat of punishment. No; the *arrangement of the passage* is this: After Paul has said that he is afraid of not finding them such as he wishes them, and of being found by them such as they would not wish him, he now gives the more precise explanation of *that first apprehension* (μήπως . . . εὔρω ὑμᾶς), by adducing *two kinds of sins*, which he fears to find among them, namely, (1) the mischiefs occasioned by *partisan feeling*; and (2) the *sins of impurity*, which would bow him down and make him sad. The further explanation regarding the *second* apprehension expressed, καὶ γὰρ εὑρεθῶ ὑμῖν οἶον οὐ θέλετε, thereupon follows only at xiii. 1 ff. — μήπως ἔρεις κ.τ.λ.] *sc.* εὑρεθῶσιν ἐν ὑμῖν. — ἔρεις, ζῆλος] *contentions*,³ *jealousy*. See 1 Cor. i. 11, iii. 3. — θυμοί] *irae, excitements of anger*. See on Rom. ii. 8; Gal. v. 20. — ἐριθεΐαι] *party-intrigues*. See on Rom. ii. 8, and the excursus of Fritzsche, I. p. 143 ff.⁴ —

¹ So that the chief emphasis is laid on κατέναντι τοῦ θεοῦ, opposed to the previous ὑμῖν.

² On ver. 20–xiii. 2, see the thorough discussion by Lücke (Whitsun Programm of 1837); *Conjectan. exeg.* Part I. p. 14 ff.

³ Regarding the plural form ἔρεις, see Lobeck, *ad Phryg.* p. 326; Gregor. Cor., ed. Schaef. p. 476; also Buttmann in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1862, p. 172.

⁴ Fritzsche (following Ilgen) is probably right in deriving ἐριθός from ἐρι, *valde* (see

καταλαλῖαι, ψιθυρισμοί] *slanders, whisperings*. See on Rom. i. 30. — φνσιώσεις] Manifestations of conceited *inflation*; elsewhere only in the Fathers. — ἀκαταστασίαι] disorderly relations, *confusions*, comp. 1 Cor. xiv. 33. (G⁷)

Ver. 21. The *interrogative* interpretation (Lachmann, Lücke) is, viewed in itself, compatible not only with the reading ταπεινώσει (Lachmann), but also with the deliberative subjunctive of the *Recepta* (Lücke). Comp. Xenophon, *Oec.* iv. 4 : μὴ αἰσχνυθῶμεν τὸν Περσῶν βασιλέα μιμήσασθαι ; see in general, Hartung, *Partikell.* II. p. 159 f. ; Baeumlein, *Partik.* p. 203. But the *usual* non-interrogative explanation, which makes μή still dependent on φοβοῦμαι, not only makes the passage appear more emphatic (by the three parallels, μήπως — μήπως — μή), but is also the only interpretation suited to the context, since, in fact, after the apprehension quite definitely expressed in ver. 20, the negative question, in the case of which a No is to be conceived as the answer (comp. vv. 17, 18), would be inappropriate. — In μή compared with the previous μήπως there lies a climax as regards the definiteness of the conception. — πάλιν] goes *along with* ἐλθόντος μου ταπεινώσει με ὁ θ. μ. πρὸς ὑμ. (comp. on ii. 1), so that Paul reminds them how already at his second visit (comp. 1 Cor. v. 9) he had experienced such humiliation. Connected merely with ἐλθόντος μου (Beza, Grotius, Flatt, de Wette, Weiseler, and many others), it would be without important bearing. — ἐλθόντος μου τάπ. με] a construction also of frequent occurrence in classical writers. Comp. on ix. 14, and see Buttmann, *neut. Gr.* p. 270 [E. T. 315]. — ταπεινώσει με, not of bodily (Hofmann), but of *mental* bowing down in dejection. Comp. Polyb. iii. 116. 8, iv. 80. 3. “Nihil erat, quo magis exultaret apostolus, quam prospero suae praedicationis successu (comp. 1 Thess. ii. 20 ; Phil. iv. 1) ; contra nihil erat, unde tristiore et demissiore animo redderetur, quam quum cerneret, se frustra laborasse,” Beza. Comp. Chrysostom. The future ταπεινώσει (see the critical remarks), which expresses the apprehension that the sad case of this humiliation *will withal actually still occur* (see on Col. ii. 8), stands in a *climactic* relation to the previous subjunctives ; the apprehension *increases*. — ὁ θεός μου] as Rom. i. 8 ; 1 Cor. i. 4. In the humbling experiences of his office Paul sees paedagogic decrees of his God. — πρὸς ὑμᾶς] not *among you*, for how superfluous that would be ! but : *in reference to you*, in my relation to you. So also Rückert, who, however (comp. Chrysostom, Osiander, and several), explains ταπεινώσεις of Paul’s seeing himself compelled “to appear before them not with the joyful pride of a father over his good children, but with the punitive earnestness of a judge.” But the punitive earnestness of the judge is in fact no ταπεινώσεις, but an act of the apostolic authority, and only follows subsequently, after the ταπεινώσεις has taken place by the *observation of the punishment-deserving state*, which has made him feel that his efforts have been without result. — πολλοὺς τῶν προημαρτηκότων καὶ μὴ μετανοησάντων] On

Buttmann, *Lexilog.* I. p. 146 f.). Comp. the many forms compounded with ἐρι in Homer. For the second part of the word no proper derivation has yet been found. This second half is not simply the ending θος,

but ιθος, since in ἐρι the iota is short, whereas in ἐριθος it is long. See Homer, *Il.* xviii. 550 : Ἐν δ’ ἐτίθει τέμενος βαθυλήϊον ἐνθα δ’ ἐριθοί. See regarding the various derivations, Lobeck, *Pathol.* p. 365.

προημαρτ., comp. Herodian, iii. 14. 8 : ἀπολογεῖσθαι πρὸς τὰ προημαρτημένα. According to Rückert, Paul has written thus inexactly, instead of πολλοὺς τῶν προημαρτ. τοὺς μὴ μετανοήσαντας. How arbitrary ! In that case he would have expressed himself with downright inaccuracy. Lücke, *l.c.* p. 20, explains it more ingeniously : “Cogitavit rem ita, ut primum poneret Christianorum ex ethnicis potissimum τῶν προημαρτηκότων καὶ μὴ μετανοησάντων genus universum, cujus generis homines essent ubique ecclesiarum, deinde vero ex isto hominum genere multos eos, qui Corinthi essent, designaret definiretque.” But the reference to the unconverted sinners, who *ubique ecclesiarum essent*, is quite foreign to the context, since Paul had simply to do with the Corinthians (comp. previously πρὸς ὑμᾶς), and hence these could not seek the genus of the προημαρτηκότων κ.τ.λ. *here meant* elsewhere than just *in their own church*. The right interpretation results undoubtedly from the order of the thoughts specified at ver. 20, according to which ἐπὶ τῇ ἀκαθαρσίᾳ κ.τ.λ. cannot belong to μετανοησ. (comp. Lucian, *de salt.* 84 : μετανοῆσαι ἐφ’ οἷς ἐποίησεν), as it is *usually* taken, but only to πενθήσω : *and that I will lament* ¹ *many of those, who have previously sinned and shall not have repented, on account of the uncleanness, etc.* Thus Paul passes over from the sinful states named in ver. 20 to quite another category of sins, and the course of thought accordingly is : “I fear that I shall not only meet with *contentions*, etc., among you, but that I shall have also to bewail many of the then still unconverted sinners among you on account of the sins of *impurity* which they have committed (Eph. iv. 30 ; Heb. xiii. 17).” Not *all* προημαρτηκοίτες καὶ μὴ μετανοήσαντες in Corinth were *impure* sinners, but Paul fears that he will encounter *many* of them as such ; hence he *could* not

¹ πενθήσω is taken by Theophylact and others, including Billroth, Rückert, Olshausen, and de Wette, as a *threatening of punishment* ; and Grotius even thought that the apostles may have discharged their penal office not without signs of mourning, “*sicut Romani civem damnaturi sumebant pullam togam.*” But the whole reference of the word to punishment is in the highest degree arbitrary, and at variance with the context. For it is only at xiii. 1 ff. that the threat of punishment follows ; and the ταπεινώσει με ὁ θεός μου πρὸς ὑμᾶς, with which καὶ πενθήσω is connected, warrants us only to retain for the latter the pure literal meaning *lugere aliquem*, which is very current in classical writers (Hom. *Il.* xix. 225, xxiii. 283 ; Herod. vii. 220 ; Xen. *Hell.* ii. 2. 3) and in the LXX. (Gen. xxxvii. 34, 1. 3, *al.* ; Eccus. li. 19 ; Judith xvi. 34). The word does *not at all* mean *to prepare sorrow*, as Vater and Olshausen explain it. Calvin therefore is right in leaving the idea of punishment out of account, and aptly remarks : “Veri et germani pastoris affectum nobis exprimit, quum luctu aliorum peccata se prosequitur dicit.” Estius,

too, rejects any reference to punishment, and finds in πενθήσω that Paul regards those concerned as *Deo mortuos*. Comp. Ewald. Under the latter view too much is found in the word, since the context does not speak of spiritual death, but specifies the ground of the mourning by ἐπὶ τῇ ἀκαθαρσίᾳ κ.τ.λ. Hence we must adhere to Calvin's exposition as not going beyond either the meaning of the word or the context. Calovius also says very correctly (in opposition to Grotius) : “Non de *poena* hic Corinthiorum impenitentium, sed de *moerore suo* super impenitentia.” De Wette, followed by Osiander, finds in πενθ. the pain of being obliged to proceed with the *special* punishment of *excommunication*, and explains πολλοὺς τῶν προημαρτ. κ. μὴ μεταν. ἐπὶ κ.τ.λ. of the *worst* among the unconverted sinners guilty of unchastity. In that case the *chief points* of the meaning must be mentally supplied, for which there is the less warrant, seeing that πενθήσω is parallel to the ταπειν. με ὁ θ., expressing *subjectively* that which is denoted by ταπειν. κ.τ.λ. *objectively*.

write at all otherwise than : πολλοὺς τῶν προημαρτηκότων καὶ μὴ μετανοησάντων.¹ This explanation is adopted by Winer, p. 590 [E. T. 792], Bisping, and Kling. — The *perfect* participle προημαρτ. denotes the *continuance* of the condition from earlier times; and καὶ μὴ μετανοησάντων has the sense of the *futurum exactum*: and who shall not have repented at my arrival. The προ in προημαρτ. expresses the sinning that had taken place *in earlier times*, which Lücke (comp. Olshausen) refers to the time *before conversion* (comp. the passages of Justin, *Apolog.* i. 61; Clement, *Strom.* iv. 12 in Lücke, p. 18 f.). But as the evils adduced in ver. 20 only set in *after* the conversion, we are not warranted (see the plan of the passage specified at ver. 20) to assume for the sins named in ver. 21 the time *before* conversion, as, indeed, 1 Cor. v. 1 also points to the time *after* conversion. But if we ask *how far* Paul with his προ looks back into the past of the Corinthians that had elapsed since their conversion, it might, if we regard vv. 20 and 21 *by themselves*, appear as if he referred not further back than to that time, in which the contentions (ver. 20) and the sins of impurity censured in 1 Cor. v. 1 (ver. 21) emerged. But as this happened only *after* his second visit, and as he says in xiii. 2 that he had foretold (comp. ii. 1) punishment to the προημαρτηκόσι already *at* his second visit, it follows that with his προ he glances back from the present to the time *before* his second visit. After his *first* visit there had already emerged in Corinth evils, which humbled him at his second visit (ver. 21), and on account of which he at that time threatened (see on xiii. 2) these προημαρτηκότες with punishment; after his *second* presence there had now broken out, in addition, the contentions

¹ The objections of de Wette against my explanation will not bear examination. For (1) from the fact that Paul, in order to express his alarm and anxiety regarding the *unchaste*, mentions withal the category of sinners in *general*, there does not arise the appearance as if he would not have to mourn over the latter; but out of the collective wickedness in Corinth he singles out the unchastity which was prevalent there as specially grievous. This *species* of sinners appears under the *genus* of Corinthian sinners as one of the two chief stains on the church (the other was the party-spirit, ver. 20). Further, (2) the προημαρτηκότες in xiii. 2 are not any more than here a *species*, but likewise the *category*, to which the kinds denoted in vv. 20 and 21 belonged. (3) The connection of ἐπὶ κ.τ.λ. with πένθησω is not unnatural, but natural, since πολλοὺς τῶν προημ. κ. μὴ μεταν., *taken together*, is the object of πένθ., so that Paul has observed the sequence which is simplest of all and most usual (*verb—object—ground*). The objections of Osiander and Hofmann are not more valid. Those of the latter especially amount in the long run to subtleties, for which there is no ground. For Paul cer-

tainly fears that he will have to lament the *non-repentance* of the persons concerned, and the *sins* which *they are still committing at the time*. This is clearly enough contained in καὶ μὴ μετανοησάντων; and as to ἡ ἔπραξαν, Paul very naturally writes the aorist, and not ἡ πράσσουσιν, because he transplants himself, as in μὴ μετανοησ., to the point of time when he *arrives* and will then judge what *they have done* up to that time. He *might* also have written ἡ πράσσουσιν, but would thereby have deviated from the conformity of his conception of time introduced with κ. μ. μετανοησ. (which is that of the *futurum exactum*), for which he had no occasion. It is incorrect, with Hofmann, to say that μετανοησάντων refers to *the time when Paul was writing this*, and that, because there was still space for them to repent up to the time of his arrival, he has not spoken generally of the impenitent, but of *many* (who, namely, would remain hardened). According to the context, μετανοησάντων can only apply to the time of his impending ἐλθεῖν, when he will have to lament many of the old and still at that time non-repentant sinners, on account of their impurity, etc.

and sins of impurity which we know from his Epistles ; and to all this, consequently to the whole time till after his first and before his second visit, he looks back, inasmuch as he says not merely ἡμαρτηκότων, but προημαρτηκότων. Consequently Billroth is wrong in restricting the word merely to those “*whom I already, through my second sojourn among you, know as sinners,*” and Estius says too indefinitely, and also quite arbitrarily, as regards προ, not starting from the present time : *ante scriptam priorem epistolam*, while many others, like Rückert, do not enter on the question at all. — ἐπὶ τῇ ἀκαθαρσίᾳ κ.τ.λ.] if connected with μετανοησάντων, would be *in respect* or *on account of*. But, apart from the fact that μετανοεῖν (which, we may add, Paul has only here) is in the N. T. never connected with ἐπί (as Joel ii. 13 ; Amos vii. 3, LXX.), but with ἀπό (Acts viii. 22 ; Heb. vi. 1) or ἐκ (Rev. ii. 21 f., xvi. 11), in this particular case the necessary and correct connection (see previously on πολλ. τ. προημ. κ. καὶ μετανοησ.) is with πενήσω, the *ground* of which it specifies : *over*. Just so Aeschin. p. 84, 14 ; Plut. Agis, 17 ; Rev. xviii. 11 ; 1 Sam. xv. 35 ; Ezra x. 6, *al.* Ἀκαθαρσία, here of *licentious* impurity, Rom. i. 24 ; Gal. v. 19 ; Eph. iv. 19. Then : πορνεία, *fornication* in specie. Lastly : ἀσέλγεια, *licentious wantonness* and *abandonment* (Rom. xiii. 13 ; Gal. v. 19 ; Eph. iv. 19 ; Wisd. xiv. 26). — ἐπραξαν] *have practised*. Comp. on Rom. i. 32.

NOTES BY AMERICAN EDITOR.

(x⁶) *Paul's view of boasting.* Ver. 1.

The Revised Version gives an exact rendering of the text as adopted by all the latest editors and by most modern expositors. “I must needs glory, though it is not expedient.” He had repeatedly spoken of boasting as a kind of folly, something derogatory and painful ; still, unseemly as it was, circumstances compelled him to resort to it. However, now he would leave it and pass to the revelations made to him.

(y⁶) “*The third heaven.*” Ver. 2.

In regard to Dr. Meyer's view that Paul had the Rabbinical notion of seven heavens, it may be said that it is by no means clear that the Jewish opinion to that effect was prevalent in Paul's day, and still less that it was adopted by the sacred writers. But as we have in Eph. iv. 10 the phrase “above all heavens,” and in Heb. iv. 14, “passed through the heavens,” it seems better to consider the words as simply = the highest heaven. This disposes also of Dr. Meyer's statement in ver. 3, that Paradise is different from the third heaven and in a higher sphere.—Paul was simply caught up to the present abode of the faithful dead.

(z⁶) “*Not lawful for a man to utter.*” Ver. 4.

It needs no argument to show that if Paul was not allowed to narrate what he had actually seen in heaven, it is certainly wrong for ordinary persons to give an account of what they imagine to have taken place there. Besides,

how could a man utter them? We have a case in point in the fourth and fifth chapters of the Apocalypse. John had heaven opened to him, and tells us the result, but it is altogether in the form of symbols and figures. A throne is there, and One like a jasper and a sardine stone; a rainbow like an emerald encircles all; seven lamps of fire are burning; lightnings flash, thunderings are heard; and a sea of glass shines like crystal. All these are marvellously suggestive, but they do not “utter the unutterable.”—And further, recent experience confirms the words of F. W. Robertson: “There are some things in this world too low to be spoken of, and some things too high. You cannot discuss such subjects without vulgarizing them.”

(A¹) “*Save in my weaknesses.*” Ver. 5.

The meaning is, “I will boast concerning myself only in those things which prove or imply my own weakness.” A revelation was a gratuitous favor, and might be gloried in without assuming any special merit to himself.

(B¹) “*He hath said.*” Ver. 9.

Dr. Meyer rightly insists upon the full sense of the perfect tense, as given in the Revised Version above. The answer was ever sounding in the Apostle’s ears, and not in his only, but in those of all God’s suffering people from that day to this.

(C¹) “*Will I glory in my infirmities.*” Ver. 9.

This is not a fanatical or irrational assertion, but based on sufficient grounds—viz. that Christ’s power may dwell upon me as a Shechinah. Most Christians are satisfied if they are resigned under suffering. To rejoice in trials because thereby Christ is glorified is more than they aspire to. Paul’s experience was far above that standard. That Christ should be glorified was to him an end for which any human being might feel it an honour to suffer (Hodge).

(D¹) “*Signs and wonders and mighty deeds.*” Ver. 12.

As the author says, these are different designations of the same thing, viz. miracles. These are called *signs* in reference to their design, i.e. to confirm the divine mission of those who perform them; *wonders*, because of the effect they produced; and *mighty deeds*, because they are manifestations of divine power. How far the Apostle was from the view of some in our day, that miracles are a burden to carry.

(E¹) “*Caught you with guile.*” Ver. 16.

It is very unfortunate that this phrase has often been quoted as if it expressed the course of the Apostle, instead of being, as Dr. Meyer says (and all critics agree), a concessive statement of the charge of his adversaries, which he proceeds in the next verse at once to deny, by an appeal to facts, viz. the mission of Titus and his companion, who followed Paul’s example in bearing their own expenses.

(F⁷) *False impressions corrected.* Ver. 19.

The closing verses of the chapter seem designed to guard against two mistakes the Corinthians might make : "First, that he felt himself accountable to them, or that they were the judges at whose bar he was defending himself. Second, that his object was in any respect personal or selfish. He spoke before God, not before them ; for their edification, not for his own reputation." The first words of ver. 19 are well given in R. V. according to the best text, "Ye think all this time that we are excusing ourselves," etc.

(G⁷) "*Lest there be strife, jealousy,*" etc. Ver. 20.

The accumulation of words serve to show the Apostle's indignation, and also to present a lively picture of the evils introduced into a Christian church by the revival of this old disease of the Grecian commonwealths (Stanley). "Swellings" = manifestations of pride and insolence. The other terms are well given in the R. V., except that "*wraths,*" an unidiomatic word, would be better replaced by "outbreaks of anger."

CHAPTER XIII.

Ver. 2. After *νῦν* Elz. has *γράφω*, in opposition to decisive evidence. A supplementary addition. Comp. ver. 10. — Ver. 4. *εἰ*] is wanting in B D* F G K S* min. Copt. Aeth. It. Eus. Dem. Theoph. Bracketed by Lachm. and Rück. Looking to the total inappropriateness of the sense of *καὶ εἰ*, those authorities of considerable importance sufficiently warrant the condemnation of *εἰ*, although Tisch. (comp. Hofm.) holds the omission to be “*manifesta correctio*.” Offence was easily taken at the idea that Christ was crucified *ἐξ ἀσθενείας*, and it was made problematical by the addition of an *εἰ*, which in several cases also was assigned a position before *καί* (Or : *εἰ γὰρ καί*). — *καὶ γὰρ ἡμεῖς*] Elz. has *καὶ γὰρ καὶ ἡμεῖς*, in opposition to far preponderating evidence. The second *καί* is an addition, which arose out of *καὶ γάρ* being taken as a mere *for*, *namque*. — *ἐν αὐτῷ*] A F G S, Syr. Erp. Copt. Boern. have *σὺν αὐτῷ*. So Lachm. on the margin. An explanation in accordance with what follows. — *ζησόμεθα*] Lachm. Rück. Tisch. read *ζήσομεν*, in favour of which the evidence is decisive. — *εἰς ὑμᾶς*] is wanting only in B D*** E*** Arm. Clar. Germ. Chrys. Sedul., and is condemned by Mill, who derived it from ver. 3. But how natural was the omission, seeing that the first half of the verse contains no parallel element ! And the erroneous reference of *ζήσομεν* to *eternal* life might make *εἰς ὑμᾶς* appear simply as irrelevant. — Ver. 7. *εὐχομαι*] Lachm. Tisch. and Rück., following greatly preponderant evidence, have *εὐχόμεθα*, which Griesb. also approved. And rightly ; the singular was introduced in accordance with the previous *ἐλπίζω*. — Ver. 9. *τοῦτο δέ*] This *δέ* is omitted in preponderant witnesses, is suspected by Griesb., and deleted by Lachm. Tisch. and Rück. Addition for the sake of connection, instead of which 73 has *δὴ* and Chrys. *γάρ*. — In ver. 10, the position of *ὁ κύριος* before *ἔδωκ. μοι* is assured by decided attestation.

CONTENTS.—Continuation of the close of the section as begun as xii. 19. At his impending third coming he will decide with judicial severity and not spare, seeing that they wished to have for once a proof of the Christ speaking in him (vv. 1–4). They ought to prove *themselves* ; he hopes, however, that they will recognize *his* proved character, and asks God that he may not need to show them its verification (vv. 5–9). Therefore he writes this when absent, in order that he may not be under the necessity of being stern when present (ver. 10). Concluding exhortation with promise (ver. 11) ; concluding salutation (ver. 12) ; concluding benediction (ver. 13.)

Ver. 1. As Paul has expressed himself by *μήπως ἔρις κ.τ.λ.* in xii. 20, and in ver. 21 has explained himself more precisely merely as regards that *μήπως ἐλθὼν οὐχ οἷους θέλω εὐρῶ ὑμᾶς* (see on xii. 20), he still owes to his readers a more precise explanation regarding the *κἀγὼ εὔρεθῶ ὑμῖν οἷον οὐ θέλετε*, and *this he now gives to them*. Observe the asyndetic, sternly-measured form of

his sentences in vv. 1 and 2. — *τρίτον τοῦτο ἔρχομαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς*] The elaborate shifts of the expositors, who do not understand this of a *third actual coming thither*, inasmuch as they assume that Paul had been but *once* in Corinth,¹ may be seen in Poole's *Synopsis* and Wolf's *Curæ*. According to Lange, *apost. Zeitalt.* I. p. 202 f. (comp. also Märcker, *Stellung der Pastoralbr.* p. 14), *τρίτον τοῦτο* is intended to apply to the third *project* of a journey, and *ἔρχομαι* to its decided *execution*: "This third time in the series of projects laid before you above *I come*." Linguistically incorrect, since *τρίτον τοῦτο ἔρχ.* cannot mean anything else than: *for the third time I come this time*, so that it does not refer to previous *projects*, but to two *journeys* that had taken place before. On *τρίτον τοῦτο*, *this third time* (accusative absolute), that is, this time for a third time, comp. Herod. v. 76: *τέταρτον δὲ τοῦτο . . . ἀπικόμενοι*, LXX. Judg. xvi. 15: *τοῦτο τρίτον ἐπλάνησάς με*, Num. xxii. 28; John xxi. 14. Bengel correctly remarks on the present: "jam sum in provincinu." (H⁷)—*ἐπὶ στόματος δύο μαρτύρων κ.τ.λ.*] On this my third arrival there is to be no further sparing (as at my second visit), but summary procedure. Comp. Matt. xviii. 16, where, however, the words of the law are used with another turn to the meaning. Paul announces with the words of the law well known to his readers, Deut. xix. 15, which he adopts as his own, that he, arrived for this third time, will, without further indulgence, institute a legal hearing of witnesses (comp. 1 Tim. v. 19), and that *on the basis of the affirmation of two and three witnesses every point of complaint will be decided*. Not as if he wished to set himself up as disciplinary judge (this power was vested ordinarily in the *church*, Matt. xviii. 16, 1 Cor. v. 12, 13, and was, even in extraordinary cases of punishment, not exercised *alone* on the part of the apostle, 1 Cor. v. 3–5), but he would bring on and arrange the summary procedure in the way of discipline, which he had threatened. Nor did the *notoriety* of the transgressions render the latter unnecessary, seeing that, on the one hand, they might not *all* be notorious, and, on the other, even those that were so needed a definite *form* of treatment. Following Chrysostom and Ambrosiaster, Calvin, Estius, and others, including recently Neander, Olshausen, Rübiger, Ewald, Osiander, Maier, have understood the two or three witnesses of *Paul himself*, who takes the various occasions of his presence among the Corinthians as testimonies, by which the *truth* of the matters is made good,² or the *execution* of *his threats* (Chrysostom, The-

¹ Most of them, like Grotius, Estius, Wolf, Wetstein, Zachariae, Flatt, were of opinion that Paul expresses here, too, simply a third *readiness* to come, from which view also has arisen the reading *ἐτοίμως ἔχω ἐλθεῖν* instead of *ἔρχομαι* in A, Syr. Erp. Copt. To this also Baur reverts, who explains *ἔρχομαι*: *I am on the point of coming*. But this would, in fact, be just a third *actual coming*, which Paul was *on the point of*, and would presuppose his *having come* already twice. Beza and others suggest: "*Binas suas epistolas* (!) *pro totidem ad illos profectionibus recenset*."

² Grotius, in consistency with the view that Paul had been only *once* there, quite at variance with the words of the passage, pares down the meaning to this: "*cum bis terve id dixerim, tandem ratum erit*." Compare also Clericus. The explanation of Emmerling: "*Titum ejusque comites certissimum edituros esse testimonium de animo suo Corinthios invisendi*," is purely fanciful. The simple and correct view is given already by Erasmus in his *Paraphr.*: "*Hic erit tertius meus ad vos adventus; in hunc se quisque praeparet. Neque enim amplius connivebo, sed juxta jus strictum atque exac-*

ophylact, and others, comp. Bleek, Billroth, Ewald, Hofmann) is to be decided (Theophylact : ἐπὶ τῶν τριῶν μου παρουσιῶν πᾶν ῥῆμα ἀπειλητικὸν κατασταθήσεται καθ' ὑμῶν καὶ κυρωθήσεται, ἐὰν μὴ μετανοήσατε· ἀντὶ μαρτύρων γὰρ τὰς παρουσίας αὐτοῦ τίθησι). But if Paul regarded himself, under the point of view of his different visits to Corinth respectively, as the witnesses, he could make himself pass for *three* witnesses only in respect of those evils which he had already perceived at his *first* visit (and then again on his *second* and *third*), and for *two* witnesses only in respect of those evils which he had lighted upon in his *second* visit for the *first* time, and would on his *third* visit encounter a *second* time. But in this view precisely all those evils and sins would be left out of account, which had *only* come into prominence *after his second visit*; for as regards these, because he was only to become acquainted with them for the *first* time at his *third* visit, he would only pass as *one* witness. Consequently this explanation, Pauline though it looks, is inappropriate; nor is the difficulty got over by the admission that the relations in question are not to be dealt with too exactly (Osiander), as, indeed, the objection, that the threat is directed against the προσημαρτηκότες, avails nothing on the correct view of xii. 21, and the continued validity of the legal ordinance itself (it holds, in fact, even at the present day in the common law) should not after 1 Tim. v. 10 have been doubted. Nor does the refining of Hofmann dispose of the matter. He thinks, forsooth, that besides the προσημαρτηκότες, all the rest also, whom such a threat may concern, are now *twice* warned, *orally* (at the second visit of the apostle) and *in writing* (by this letter), and his *arrival* will be to them the *third* and *last* admonition to reflect. This is not appropriate either to the words (see on ver. 2) or to the necessary unity and equality of the idea of *witnesses*, with which, in fact, Paul—and, moreover, in application of so solemn a passage of the law—would have dealt very oddly, if not only *he himself* was to represent the three witnesses, but one of them was even to be his *letter*. — καὶ] not in the sense of ἡ, as, following the Vulgate, many earlier and modern expositors (including Flatt and Emmerling) would take it, but : *and*, if, namely, there are so many.¹ Paul might have put ἡ, as in Matt. xviii. 16, but, following the LXX., he has thought on *and*, and therefore *put* it. — πᾶν ῥῆμα] everything that comes to be spoken of, to be discussed. Comp. on Matt. iv. 4. — σταθήσεται] *will be established* (םִּיָּקָם), namely, for judicial decision. This is more in keeping with the original text than (comp. on Matt. xxvi. 25) : *will be weighed* (Ewald).

Ver. 2. Ὡς παρὼν . . . νῦν is not to be put in a parenthesis, since it is a definition to προλέγω, which interrupts neither the construction nor the sense. *I have said before, and say beforehand, as at my second visit* (“sicut feci, cum secundo vobiscum essem,” Er. Schmid), *so also in my present absence, to those who have formerly sinned, and to all the rest, that, when I shall have come again, I will not spare*. Accordingly ὥς παρὼν τὸ δεύτερον leaves no doubt as to the

tum res agetur. Quisquis delatus fuerit, is duorum aut trium hominum testimonio vel absolvetur vel damnabitur.”

¹ It corresponds quite to the German ex-

pression “zwei bis drei.” Comp. Xen. Anab. iv. 7. 10: δύο καὶ τρία βήματα. See Krüger and Kühner *in loc*. In this case καὶ is *atque*, not *also* (Hofmann).

temporal reference of *προεῖρηκα*. Moreover, from ver. 2 *alone* the presence of the apostle, which had already *twice* taken place, could not be proved. For, if we knew that he had been only *once*, *προεῖρηκα* would certainly refer to the first epistle, and *ὡς παρὼν κ.τ.λ.* would have to be explained : *as if I were present for the second time, although I am now absent* (comp. Grotius, Estius, Bengel, Rosenmüller, Flatt, Baur, and others).¹ But, as it is clear from other passages that Paul had already been twice in Corinth, and as here in particular *τρίτον τοῦτο ἔρχομαι* immediately goes before, that view, in which also the *νῦν* would simply be superfluous and cumbrous, is impossible. Beza, who is followed by Zachariae and Märcker, connects awkwardly (seeing that *τὸ δεύτερον* and *νῦν* must correspond to each other) *τὸ δεύτερον* with *προλέγω*. Hofmann also misses the correct view, when he makes *ὡς* serve merely to annex the *quality* ("as one having been there a second time, and now absent"), in which the apostle has said and says beforehand. In this way *ὡς* would be the *quippe qui* from the conception of the speaker, as in 1 Cor. vii. 25, and *παρὼν* would be imperfect. The two clauses of the sentence, however, contain in fact not qualities subjectively conceived, but two *objective relations of time*; and hence *ὡς*, if it is to have the sense given above, would simply be irrelevant (comp. 1 Cor. v. 3a; 2 Cor. x. 11; Phil. i. 27) and confusing. Paul would have simply written : *προεῖρηκα παρὼν τὸ δεύτερον καὶ προλέγω ἄπὸν νῦν*. — *τοῖς προσημαρτηκόσι*] See on xii. 21. It is self-evident, we may add, that the *προ* in *προσημαρτ.* has from the standpoint of the *προλέγω* a greater period of the past behind it than from the standpoint of the *προεῖρηκα*, and that the *προσημαρτηκότες*, whom the present *προλέγω* threatens, were more, and in part other, than those to whom at the second visit the *προεῖρηκα* had applied. The *category*, however, is the same; and hence it is not to be said, with Lücke, that from our passage it is clear : "quibus nunc, tanquam προσημαρτηκόσι, severiorem castigationem minatur apostolus, eosdem jam tunc, quum olim (προεῖρηκα) minitatus esset, προσημαρτηκότες fuisse." Paul had at his second presence threatened the *προσημαρτηκότες*, and he threatens them also now. On the two occasions the threat referred to the same *genus hominum*, to those who had sinned before the time at which Paul discoursed to the Corinthians, and were still sinners; but the *individuals* were not on the two occasions quite the same. Certainly at least there were *now* (*προλέγω*) not a few among them, who had not been included on the *previous* occasion (see 1 Cor. i. 11, v. 1, comp. with 2 Cor. xii. 20, 21). — *καὶ τοῖς λοιποῖς πᾶσιν*] Thus *τοῖς μὴ προσημαρτηκόσι*. To these he then said it

¹ To this category belongs also the strange view of Lange, *apost. Zeitalt.* I. p. 203: "This is the second time that I am present among you and yet absent at the same time." Paul, namely, had, in Lange's view, the *spirit-like gift* of transplanting himself with the full spiritual power of his authority during his absence into the midst of the distant church, which had doubtless felt the *thunderclap* of his spiritual appearing. In Corinth this had taken place the first

time at the exclusion of the incestuous person, 1 Cor. v. 3, and the second time now. Of such fancies and spiritualistic notions there is nowhere found any trace in the apostle. And what are we to make in that case of the *νῦν*? The only correct view of this *νῦν* and its relation to *τὸ δεύτερον* is already given by Chrysostom: *παρεγενόμενν δεύτερον καὶ εἶπον, λέγω δὲ καὶ νῦν διὰ τῆς ἐπιστολῆς, ἀνάγκη με λοιπὸν ἀληθεῦσαι*. Comp. also ver. 10.

before, and he says it so now, *by way of warning*, of deterring. It is the *entire remaining members of the church* that are meant, and Paul mentions them, not as *witnesses*, but in order that they make the threatening serve according to the respective requirements of their moral condition to stimulate reflection and discipline ; hence τοῖς λοιποῖς, even according to our view of προημαρτ., is not without suitable meaning (in opposition to de Wette). — εἰς τὸ πάλιν] On the πάλιν used substantivally, see Bernhardt, p. 328, and on εἰς in the specification of a term of time, Matthiae, p. 1345. Comp. εἰς αὐθις, εἰς ὁψέ, ἐς τέλος, and the like. — οὐ φείσομαι] The reasons *why* Paul *spared* them in his *second*, certainly but very short, visit, are as little known to us, as the reason why Luke, who has in fact passed over so much, has made no mention of this second visit in the Book of Acts.

Ver. 3. I will not spare you ; for ye in fact will not have it otherwise ! Ye challenge, in fact, by your demeanour, an experimental proof of the Christ that speaks in me. Thus ἐπεὶ, before which we are to conceive a pause, annexes the *cause serving as motive* of the οὐ φείσομαι, that was under the prevailing circumstances at work. Emmerling begins a protasis with ἐπεὶ, parenthesizes ὃς εἰς ὑμᾶς κ.τ.λ., and the whole fourth verse, and regards εἰς αὐτοὺς πειράζεετε in ver. 5 as apodosis. So, too, Lachmann, Olshausen, Ewald, who, however, treat as a parenthesis merely ver. 4. This division as a whole would not yield as its result any illogical connection, for, *because* the readers wish to put *Christ* to the proof, it was the more advisable for them to prove *themselves*. But the passage is rendered, quite unnecessarily, more complicated and cumbrous. — ἐπεὶ δοκιμὴν ζητεῖτε κ.τ.λ.] That is, since you make it your aim that the Christ speaking in me shall verify Himself, shall give you a *proof of His judicial working*. To take τοῦ . . . Χριστοῦ as genitive of *the subject* (comp. ix. 13 ; Phil. ii. 22) better suits the following ὃς καὶ ὑμᾶς κ.τ.λ., than the objective rendering (Billroth and Rückert, following older expositors) : *a proof of the fact that Christ speaks in me*. — ὃς εἰς ὑμᾶς οὐκ ἄσθενεῖ κ.τ.λ.] *who in reference to you is not impotent, but mighty among you*. By this the readers are made to feel how critical and dangerous is their challenge of Christ practically implied in the evil circumstances of the church (xii. 20 f.), for the Christ speaking in the apostle is not weak towards them, but provided with power and authority among them, as they would feel, if He should give them a practical attestation of Himself. A special reference of δυνατεῖ ἐν ὑμῖν to the *miracles, spiritual gifts*, and the like, such as Erasmus, Grotius,¹ Fritzsche,² de Wette, and others assume, is not implied in the connection (see especially ver. 4) ; and just as little a retrospective reference to x. 10 (Hofmann). — Of the use of the verb δυνατεῖν no examples from other writers are found, common as was ἀδυνατεῖν. Its use in *this* particular place by Paul was involuntarily suggested to him by

¹ Grotius : "Non opus habetis ejus rei periculum facere, cum jampridem Christus per me apud vos ingentia dederit potentiae suae signa."

² Fritzsche, *Diss.* II. p. 141 : "qui Christus χάρισμα largiendo, miracula regundo,

religionis impedimenta tollendo, ecclesiam moderando, ipse vobis se fortem ostendit." This emphatic *ipse* is imported,—which arose out of Fritzsche's regarding *the apostle*, not Christ, as the subject of δοκιμὴν.

the similar sound of the opposite ἀσθενεῖ. Yet he has it also in Rom. xiv. 4 ; as regards 2 Cor. ix. 8, see the critical remarks on that passage. — ἐν ὑμῖν] not of the *internal indwelling* and *pervading* (Hofmann), which is at variance with the context, since the latter has the penal retribution as its main point ; but the Christ speaking in Paul has the power of asserting Himself *de facto* as the *vindex* of His word and work *in the church*, so far as it is disobedient to Him and impenitent.

Ver. 4. Καὶ γὰρ ἐσταυρ. ἐξ ἀσθ., ἀλλὰ ζῇ ἐκ δυνάμ. θεοῦ] Reason assigned for the previous ὅς εἰς ὑμᾶς οὐκ ἀσθενεῖ, ἀλλὰ δυνατεῖ ἐν ὑμῖν : *for even crucified was He from weakness, but He is living from the power of God.*¹ Without μέν after ἐσταυρ. the contrast comes in with the more striking effect. ἐξ ἀσθενείας denotes the causal origin of the ἐσταυρώθη, and is not, with Chrysostom (who complains of the difficulty of this passage), to be interpreted of *apparent* weakness, but finds its explanation in viii. 9 ; Phil. ii. 7 f. Jesus, namely, had, in the state of His exinanition and humiliation, obedient to the Father, entered in such wise into the condition of powerless endurance as man, that He yielded to the violence of the most ignominious execution, to which He had, according to the Father's will, submitted Himself ; *and accordingly it came ἐξ ἀσθενείας, that He was crucified.* But since His resurrection *He lives* (Rom. v. 10, vi. 9, xiv. 9, *al.*), and that *from the power of God*, for God has, by His power, raised Him up (see on Rom. vi. 4) and exalted Him to glory (Acts ii. 33 ; Eph. i. 20 ff. ; Phil. ii. 9). To make the θεοῦ refer to ἀσθενείας also (Hofmann, who inappropriately compares 1 Cor. i. 25) would yield a thought quite abnormal and impossible for the apostle, which the very οὐκ ἀσθενεῖ, ver. 3, ought to have precluded. — καὶ γὰρ ἡμεῖς κ.τ.λ.] Confirmation of the immediately preceding καὶ γὰρ . . . θεοῦ, and that in respect of the two points ἐξ ἀσθενείας and ζῇ ἐκ δυνάμεως θεοῦ. “That the case stands so with Christ as has just been said, is confirmed from the fact, that these two relations, on the one hand of weakness, and on the other of being alive ἐκ δυνάμ. θεοῦ, are found also in us in virtue of our fellowship with Him. It is an *argumentum ab effectu ad causam* issuing from the lofty sense of this fellowship, a bold certainty derived from experience, the argumentative stress of which, contained in ἐν αὐτῷ and σὺν αὐτῷ,

¹ The *Recepta* καὶ γὰρ εἰ ἐσταυρ. would yield the quite unsuitable sense : *for even if*, i.e. *even in the event that, He has been crucified*, etc. Καὶ εἰ should not, with the Vulgate and the majority of expositors, be taken as *although*, for in that case it would be confounded with εἰ καί. Καὶ εἰ means *even if*, so that the climactic καί applies to the conditional particle. See Hartung, I. p. 140 f. ; Haack. *ad Thuc.* p. 562 f. ; Stallbaum, *ad Plat. Ap. S.* p. 32 A, *Gorg.* p. 509 A. De Wette wrongly rejects my view of the *Recepta*, making καὶ γὰρ signify merely *for*. It always means *for even*. See Hartung, I. p. 148 ; Stallbaum, *ad Plat. Gorg.* p. 467 B. So, too, immediately in the καὶ γὰρ ἡμεῖς that follows. Hofmann quite er-

roneously takes the *Recepta* in such a way, that Paul with καὶ εἰ merely expresses a real fact conditionally on account of his *wishing to keep open the possibility of looking at it also otherwise*. In that case ἐξ ἀσθενείας would really be the point of consequence in the protasis, and the apostle must at least have written καὶ γὰρ εἰ ἐξ ἀσθενείας ἐσταυρώθη. Besides, the leaving open a possible other way of regarding the matter would have no ground at all in the text. A mistaken view is adopted also by Osiander, who has taken καί as the *also* of *comparison*, namely, of Christ *with His servant* (consequently, as if καὶ γὰρ αὐτός had stood in the text).

bears the triumphant character of strength in weakness. Hofmann wrongly, in opposition to the clear and simple connection, desires to take καὶ γὰρ ἡμεῖς ἀσθ. ἐν αὐτῷ, which he separates from the following ἀλλὰ κ.τ.λ., as a proof for the clause ὅς εἰς ὑμᾶς οὐκ ἀσθενεῖ, ἀλλὰ δυνατεῖ ἐν ὑμῖν, for which reason he imports into ἐν αὐτῷ the contrast : *not a weakness of the natural man*. This contrast, although in substance of itself correct, is not here, any more than afterwards in σὺν αὐτῷ, intentionally present to the mind of the apostle. — ἀσθενοῦμεν ἐν αὐτῷ] Paul represents his *sparing* hitherto observed towards the Corinthians (for it is quite at variance with the context to refer ἀσθ., with Chrysostom, Theodoret, Theophylact, Grotius, Estius, and others, to sufferings and persecutions) as a *powerlessness* based on his fellowship with Christ, inasmuch as Christ also had been weak and ἐσταυρώθη ἐξ ἀσθενείας.¹ But that is only a transient powerlessness ; *we shall be alive with Him through the power of God in reference to you*. (17) As he is conscious, namely, of that impotence as having its ground in Christ, he is conscious also of this being alive in union with Christ as fellowship with His life (σὺν αὐτῷ), and hence proceeding ἐκ δυνάμεως θεοῦ, as Christ's being alive also flowed from this source, Rom. i. 4, vi. 4, *al.* — Εἰς ὑμᾶς, lastly, gives to the ζήσομεν (which is not, with Theodoret, Anselm, and Grotius, to be referred to the *future* life) its concrete direction and special reference of its meaning : ² *we shall be alive* (*vigere*, comp. 1 Thess. iii. 8) *in reference to you*, namely, through the effective assertion of the power divinely conferred on us, especially through apostolic judging and punishing (see vv. 1, 2). “Non est vivere, sed *valere* vita,” Martial, vi. 70. Comp. for the pregnant reference of ζῶ, Xen. *Mem.* iii. 3. 11 ; Plato, *Legg.* vii. p. 809 D ; Dio Cass. lxix. 19. Calvin well observes : “*Vitam* opponit *infirmi*tati, ideoque hoc nomine *florentem et plenum dignitatis statum* intelligit.”

Ver. 5. Now he brings the readers to themselves. Instead of wishing to put to the proof *Christ* (in Paul), they should try *themselves* (πειράζειν, to put to the test, and that by comparison of their Christian *state* with what they *ought* to be), prove *themselves* (δοκιμάζειν). Oecumenius and Theophylact correctly estimate the force of the twice emphatically prefixed ἐαυτούς ; δοκιμάζειν, however, is not, any more than in 1 Cor. xi. 8, equivalent to δόκιμον ποιεῖν (Rückert) ; but what Paul had previously said by πειραζετε, εἰ ἐστὲ ἐν τ. π., he once more sums up, and that with a glance back to ver. 3, emphatically by the *one* word δοκιμάζετε. — εἰ ἐστὲ ἐν τῇ πίστει] dependent on πειραζετε, not on δοκιμάζετε : whether ye are *in the faith*, whether ye find yourselves in the *fides salvifica* (not to be taken of faith in miracles, as Chrysostom would have it), which is the fundamental condition of all Christian character and life. The εἶναι ἐν τῇ πίστει stands opposed to mere nominal Christianity. — ἢ οὐκ ἐπιγινώσκετε κ.τ.λ.] not ground of the obligation to prove themselves the more strictly (“si id sentitis, bene tractate tantum hospitem,” Grotius,

¹ This *impotence* is not to be conceived as *involuntary* (de Wette, following Schwarz in Wolf), but as *voluntary* (comp. οὐ φείσομαι, ver. 2), as Christ's weakness also was voluntary, namely, the impotence of deep-

est resignation and self-surrender, and this was its very characteristic. Comp. Heb. xii. 2.

² Hence εἰς ὑμᾶς is not, with Castalio and Rückert, to be joined to δυνάμ. θεοῦ.

comp. Osiander, Maier, and others) ; for the ἐπιγινώσκειν already presupposes the self-trial, not the converse (Hofmann). On the contrary, Paul lays hold of the readers by their Christian *sense of honour*, that they should not be *afraid* of this trial of themselves. Or does not this *proving* of yourselves lead you to the *knowledge* of yourselves, that Christ is in you ? (J⁷) Are you then so totally devoid of the Christian character, that that self-trial has not the holy result of your discerning in yourselves what is withal the necessary consequence¹ of the εἶναι ἐν τῇ πίστει : that Christ is in you (by means of the Holy Spirit) present and active ? Comp. Gal. ii. 20 ; Eph. iii. 17. The construction ἐαυτοὺς ὅτι Ἰ. Χ. ἐν ὑμῖν ἐστίν is not a case of attraction, since in ὅτι κ.τ.λ., ὑμεῖς is not the subject (see on Gal. iv. 11), but ὅτι defines more precisely (*that, namely*). And the full name Ἰησοῦς Χριστός has solemn emphasis. — εἰ μήτι ἀδόκιμοί ἐστε] After this a mark of interrogation is not to be repeated, but a period to be placed. That Christ is in you, you will perceive, if you are not perchance (εἰ μήτι, comp. 1 Cor. vii. 5) spurious Christians. (κ¹) In such, no doubt, Christ is not ! Rom. viii. 9 f. To attach it merely to the predicated clause itself (Ἰ. Χ. ἐν ὑμ. ἐ.) as a limitation (Hofmann), is at variance with the very γνώσεσθε, ὅτι that follows in ver. 6, in keeping with which that exception εἰ μήτι κ.τ.λ. is to be included under the ὅτι κ.τ.λ. attached to ἐπιγινώσκ. ἐαυτούς. In εἰ μήτι the τι serves (like *forte*) “*incertius pronuntiandae rei*,” Ellendt, *Lex. Soph.* I. p. 496. According to Ewald, εἰ μήτι ἀδ. ἐστε depends on δοκιμάζετε, and ἡ οὐ ἐπιγινώσκ. . . . ἐν ὑμῖν ἐστίν is to be a parenthesis—a construction which is harsh and the less necessary, seeing that, according to the usual connection, the thoughtful glance in the ἀδόκιμοί ἐστε back to ἐαυτοὺς δοκιμάζετε is retained.

Ver. 6. The case of the ἀδόκιμον εἶναι, however, which he has just laid down as possible perhaps in respect of the *readers*, shall not, he hopes, occur *with him* : you shall discern (in pursuance of experience) that we are not unattested, ungenuine, that is, “*non deesse nobis experimenta et argumenta potestatis et virtutis, qua in refractarios uti possimus*,” Wolf. Comp. vv. 7, 9. Not without bitterness is this said. But the object of the hoping is not the *desert of punishment* on the part of the readers, but the δοκιμή of the apostolic authority *in the event* of their deserving punishment. Ἀπειλητικῶς τοῦτο τέθεικεν, ὡς μέλλων αὐτοῖς τῆς πνευματικῆς δυνάμεως παρέχειν ἀπόδειξιν, Theodoret. According to others (Beza, Calvin, Balduin, Calovius, Bengel), Paul expresses the hope that they would *amend* themselves and *thereby* evince the power of his apostolic influence. This, as the blending of the two views (Flatt, Osiander), is opposed to the context in vv. 3 f., 7, 9. Not till ver. 7 does Paul turn to the expression of gentle, pious love.

Ver. 7. Yet we pray to God that this, my apostolic attestation, which I hope to give you means of discerning, may not be made necessary on your part. On εὐχόμεθα (see the critical remarks), compared with the ἐλπίζω used just before, observe that, as often in Paul and especially in this Epistle of vivid emotion, the interchange of the singular and the plural forms of expressing

¹ The εἶναι ἐν τ. πίστει and the Χριστὸς ἐν ὑμῖν are not equivalent, but are related to

each other as cause and effect. Comp. Weiss, *bibl. Theol.* p. 348.

himself has by no means always special grounds by which it is determined. — *μὴ ποιῆσαι ὑμᾶς κακὸν μηδέν*] *that ye may do nothing evil*, which, in fact, would only keep up and increase your guilt. Others incorrectly take it,¹ “that I be not compelled *to do something evil to you*.” How could Paul have so designated his chastisement? For that *ποιεῖν κακόν* stands here, not in the sense : to do *something to one’s harm*, but in the *ethical* sense, is shown by the contrast *τὸ καλὸν ποιῆτε* in what follows. But even apart from this, in fact, because *εὐχόμεθα* receives through *πρὸς τὸν θεόν* (comp. Xen. *Mem.* i. 3. 2 ; 2 Macc. ix. 13, xv. 27 ; Num. xxi. 8, *al.*) the meaning *we pray*, the words, in the event of *ποιῆσαι ὑμᾶς* not being held to be accusative with infinitive, would have to be explained : *to pray to God that He may do nothing evil to you*—which would be absurd. But the accusative with the infinitive occurs as in Acts xxvi. 19. — *οὐχ ἵνα ἡμεῖς κ.τ.λ.*] Statement of the object, for which he makes this entreaty to God, first negatively and then positively ; not in a selfish design, not in order that *we* may appear through your moral conduct as attested) in so far, namely, as the excellence of the disciple is the attestation of the teacher, comp. iii. 2 f., Phil. iv. 1, 1 Thess. ii. 20, *al.*), but *on your account*, in order that *ye* may do what is good, and thus the attestation may be on *your* side and we may be as unattested, in so far, namely, as we cannot in that case show ourselves in our apostolic authority (by sternness and execution of punishment). That he should with *δόκιμοι* and *ἀδόκιμοι* refer to two different modes of his *δοκιμή*, is quite a Pauline trait. Through the moral walk of the readers he was manifested on the one hand as *δόκιμος*, on the other as *ἀδόκιμος* ; what he intended in his *εὐχόμεθα πρὸς τὸν θεόν κ.τ.λ.* was not the former, for it was not about himself that he was concerned, but the latter, because it was simply the attestation of the readers by the *ποιεῖν τὸ καλόν* that he had at heart. According to Olshausen, there is meant to be conveyed in *οὐχ ἵνα ἡμεῖς δόκ. φανῶμ.* : *not in order that the fulfilment of this prayer may appear as an effect of my powerful intercession*. But Paul must have said this, if he had meant it. Others² hold that after *οὐχ* there is to be supplied *εὐχομαι*, or the idea of wish implied in it, and *ἵνα* expresses its *contents* ; “I do not wish that I should show myself as standing the test (that is, stern), but rather that ye may do what is good and I be as not standing the test (that is, may appear not standing the test, and so not stern),” Billroth. Certainly the contents of *εὐχεσθαι* might be conceived as its aim, and hence be expressed by *ἵνα* (Jas. v. 16 ; Col. i. 9 ; 2 Thess. i. 11) ; but in this particular case the previous *infinitive* construction, expressing the contents of the prayer, teaches us that Paul has *not* so conceived it. Had he conceived it so, he would have simply led the readers astray by *ἵνα*. The explanation is *forced*, and simply for the reason that the fine point of a double aspect of

¹ So Billroth, Ewald, Hofmann, and previously Flatt and Emmerling, as in the first instance Grotius, who says : “Ne cogar cuiquam poenam infligere, quae *malum* dicitur, quia dura est toleratu.” On *ποιεῖν τινά τι*, comp. Matt. xxvii. 22 ; Mark xv.

12. Elsewhere always in the N. T. *ποιεῖν τινί τι*.

² So Billroth and Osiander and others, as well as previously Flatt, Zachariae, Estius, Menochius, *al.*

the δοκιμή was not appreciated. From this point of view Paul might have said in a connection like vi. 8 f. : ὡς ἀδόκιμοι καὶ δόκιμοι. — ὡς ἀδόκιμοι] Beza aptly says : *hominum videlicet judicio*. By way of appearance. Comp. already Chrysostom.

Ver. 8. Reason assigned for the relation just expressed as aimed at by ἵνα ὑμεῖς τὸ καλὸν ποιῆτε, ἡμεῖς δὲ ὡς ἀδόκιμοι ὤμεν. That we really have this design, is based on the fact that we are not in a position to do anything against the truth, but for the truth. The ἀλήθεια is to be taken in the habitual sense of the N. T. : the truth κατ' ἐξοχήν, the divine truth, *i.e.* the *gospel* ; comp. iv. 2, vi. 7. If Paul, forsooth, had not had the design that the readers should do what is good, and he himself appear without punitive power and consequently as unattested, he would have *counteracted* the gospel, in so far as it aims at establishing Christian morality, requires penitence, announces forgiveness to the penitent, etc. ; but he is not in a position to do so (L⁷) To take ἀλήθεια, with Flatt and older expositors,¹ as *moral* truth (see on 1 Cor. v. 8), *uprightness*, is a limitation of it, which the context all the less suggests, seeing that ἀλήθεια in the above sense embraces in it the moral element. The taking it in the *judicial* sense would be accordant with the context (ἵνα ἀληθῆ φέρωμεν τὴν ψῆφον, Theophylact, so Chrysostom, Theodoret, Grotius : “quod rectum justumque est ;” Cornelius à Lapide, Bengel, de Wette : “the true state in which the matter finds itself ;” so, too, Rübiger) ; yet, in that case, there would result an inappropriate contrast, since ὑπὲρ τ. ἀλ. can only mean “for the benefit of the truth,” which presupposes a more comprehensive idea of ἀλήθ. (de Wette : “to further the truth”). — ἀλλ' ὑπὲρ τ. ἀλ.] *sc.* δυνάμεθά τι, *we are able to do something*.

Ver. 9. Not reason assigned for ver. 7 (Hofmann), but confirmation of what is said in ver. 8 from the subjective relation of the apostle to the readers, in which χαίρομεν has the emphasis. This joy is as the living seal of the heart to that axiom. — ἀσθενῶμεν] according to the connection, quite the same as ἀδόκιμοι ὤμεν in ver. 7, of the state in which the apostle is not in a position to exercise punitive authority on account of the Christian conduct of his readers. Comp. ver. 4. — δυνατοί] correlative to the ἀσθενῶμεν, consequently : *such as* (on account of their Christian excellence) *one can do nothing to* with the power of punishment. The latter is *powerless* in presence of such a moral disposition. The context does not yield more than this contrast ; even the thought, that the δυνατοί *guard themselves against all that* would call forth the punitive authority (Hofmann), is here foreign to it. — τοῦτο καὶ εὐχόμεθα] *this*, namely, that ye may be strong, *we also pray* ; it is not merely the object of our joy, but also of our prayers. On the *absolute* εὐχεσθαι used of *praying* (for after ver. 7 it is not here merely *wishing*), comp. Jas. v. 16 ; often in classic writers. There is no reason for taking the τοῦτο adverbially : *thereupon, on that account* (Ewald). — τὴν ὑμῶν κατάρτισιν] epexegetis of τοῦτο : namely, *your full preparation, complete furnishing, perfection in Christian morality*. Comp. κατάρτισμός, Eph. iv. 12. Beza and

¹ So Photius in Oecumenius, p. 709 D : ἀλήθειαν τὴν εὐσέβειαν καλεῖ ὡς νόθου ὄντος τοῦ δυσσεβοῦς βίου, and previously Pelagius :

“Innocentiae enim nostra sententia obesse non poterit ;” as also Erasmus, Mosheim, and others.

Bengel think of the readjustment of the *members* of the body of the church that had been dislocated by the disputes (see on 1 Cor. i. 10, and Kypke, II. p. 290)—a special reference, which is not suggested in the context. See ver. 7.

Ver. 10. *This*, namely, that I wish to have you δυνατούς or κατηρτισμένους and pray accordingly, *this is the reason why I write this when absent, in order not to proceed sharply when present*, etc. He wishes that he may be spared from the οὐ φείσομαι threatened in ver. 2, and that he may see the earnest anxiety, which he had already expressed at xii. 20 f., dispelled. In virtue of this view of its practical bearing, ταῦτα is to be referred, not to the whole Epistle, but (comp. Osiander and Hofmann) to the current section from xii. 20 onward. — ἀποτόμως] literally, *curtly*,—that is, with thoroughgoing sternness,—the same figurative conception as in our *schroff*, *scharf* [English, *sharply*]. In the N. T. only recurring at Tit. i. 13. Comp. Wisd. v. 22, and Grimm *in loc.* ; ἀποτομία, Rom. xi. 22. More frequently in classical writers. See, in general, Fritzsche, *ad Rom.* II. p. 508 ; Hermann, *ad Soph. O. R.* 877. — On χράομαι without dative, with adverb, *to deal with*, comp. Esth. i. 19, ix. 27, ix. 12 ; 2 Macc. xii. 14 ; Polyb. xii. 7. 3. — ἣν ὁ Κύριος ἔδωκέ μοι εἰς οἶκον. κ.τ.λ.] contains a reason *why* he might not proceed ἀποτόμως, as thereby he could not but act at variance with the destined purpose for which Christ had given to him his apostolic authority, or at least could serve it only indirectly (in the way of sharp chastening with a view to amendment). Comp. x. 8. If we connect the whole κατὰ τ. ἐξουσίαν κ.τ.λ. with γράφω (Hofmann), the ἵνα παρὼν μὴ ἀποτόμ. χρήσωμαι is made merely a parenthetical thought, which is not in keeping with its importance according to the context (ver. 7 ff.), and is forbidden by the emphasized correspondence of ἀπὼν and παρὼν (comp. ver. 2). This emphasis is all the stronger, seeing that ἀπὼν in itself would be quite superfluous.

Ver. 11. Closing exhortation. Bengel aptly observes : “Severius scripserat Paulus in tractatione, nunc benignius, re tamen ipsa non dimissa.” — λοιπόν] See on Eph. vi. 10. What I otherwise have still to impress on you is, etc. : “Verbum est properantis sermonem absolvere,” Grotius. — χαίρετε] not : *valete* (for the apostolic *valete* follows only at ver. 13), as Valla, Erasmus, and Beza have it, but *gaudete* (Vulgate). Encouragement to Christian joy of soul, Phil. iii. 1, iv. 4. And the salvation in Christ is great enough to call upon even a church so much injured and reproached to rejoice. Comp. i. 24. — καταρτίζεσθε] *let yourselves be brought right*, put into the right Christian frame ; τέλειοι γίνεσθε, ἀναπληροῦτε τὰ λειπόμενα, Chrysostom. Comp. 1 Cor. i. 10 ; and see Suicer, *Thes.* II. p. 60. — παρακαλεῖσθε] is by most, including Billroth, Schrader, Osiander, correctly understood of *consolation* ; *become comforted* over everything that assails and makes you to need comfort, *consolationem admittite!* ἐπεὶ γὰρ πολλοὶ ἦσαν οἱ πειρασμοὶ καὶ μεγάλοι οἱ κίνδυνοι, Chrysostom. Rückert no doubt thinks that there was nothing to be comforted ; but the summons has, just like what was said at i. 7, its good warrant, since at that time every church was placed in circumstances needing comfort. Rückert's own explanation : *care for your spiritual elevation*, is an arbitrary extension of the definite sense of the word to an

indefinite domain. Others, following the Vulgate (*exhortamini*), such as Rosenmüller, Flatt, Ewald, Hofmann, render : *accept exhortations to what is good*, which, however, in the connection is too vague and insipid ; while de Wette, following Pelagius, Cornelius à Lapide, and others (exhort ye *one another*), *imports* an essential element, which Paul would have expressed by παρακαλεῖτε ἀλλήλους (1 Thess. iv. 18, v. 11) or ἑαυτοὺς (Heb. iii. 13). — τὸ αὐτὸ φρονεῖτε] demands *the being harmonious* as identity of sentiment. See on Phil. ii. 2. — εἰρηνεύετε] *have peace* (one with another), Rom. xii. 18 ; 1 Thess. v. 13 ; Mark ix. 50 ; Plat. *Theaet.* p. 180 A ; Polyb. v. 8. 7 ; Ecclus. xxviii. 9, 13. It is the happy consequence of the τὸ αὐτὸ φρονεῖν ; with the δίχα φρονεῖν it could not take place. — καὶ ὁ θεὸς κ.τ.λ.] This encouraging promise refers, as is clear from τῆς ἀγάπης καὶ εἰρήνης, merely to the two last points especially needful in Corinth—to the harmony and the keeping of peace ; hence a colon is to be put after παρακαλεῖσθε. And then, if ye do that (καί, with future after imperatives, see Winer, p. 293 [E. T. 392]), will God, who works the love and the peace (Rom. xv. 13, xvi. 20 ; Phil. iv. 9 ; 1 Thess. v. 23 ; Heb. xiii. 20), help you with His presence of grace. The characteristic *genitival definition* of God is *argumentative*, exhibiting the certainty of the promise as based on the moral nature of God. (M⁷)

Ver. 12, 13. As to the saluting *by the holy kiss*, see on 1 Cor. xvi. 20. — οἱ ἅγιοι πάντες] namely, *at the place and in the vicinity*, where Paul was writing, in Macedonia. It was obvious of itself to the readers that they were not saluted by *all Christians generally* (Theodoret). It by no means follows from this salutation that the Epistle had been *publicly read* at the place of its composition (possibly Philippi) in the church (Calovius, Osiander), but simply that they *knew* of the composition of the Epistle. Nor is any special set purpose to be sought as underlying the current designation of Christian ἅγιοι (“utpote sanguine Christi lotos et Dei Spiritu regenitos et sanctificados,” Calovius). According to Osiander, the higher value and blessing of the brotherly greeting is meant to be indicated ; but comp. 1 Cor. xv. 20, οἱ ἀδελφοὶ πάντες. — Paul does not add *salutations to individuals* by name ; these Titus might orally convey, and the apostle himself came, in fact, soon after (Acts xx. 2).

Ver. 14. Concluding wish of blessing—whether written by his own hand (Hofmann) is an open question—full and solemn as in no other Epistle, *tripartite* in accordance with the divine Trinity,¹ from which the three highest blessings of eternal salvation come to believers. — *The grace of Christ* (comp. Rom. v. 15, i. 7 ; 1 Cor. i. 3 ; 2 Cor. i. 2, viii. 9 ; Gal. vi. 18 ; Eph. i. 2 ; Phil. i. 2 ; 2 Thess. i. 2 ; Philem. 25), which is continuously active in favour of His own (Rom. viii. 34 ; 2 Cor. xii. 8), is first adduced, because it is the *medians*, Rom. v. 1, viii. 34, between believers and the *love of God*, that *causa principalis* of the grace of Christ (Rom. v. 8), as it also forms the presupposition of the *efficacy of the Spirit*, Rom. viii. 1, 2. The *fellowship of the Holy Spirit*—that is, the participation in the gracious efficacy of the

¹ On the old liturgical use of this formula of blessing, see *Constit. apost.* viii. 5, viii. 12. 3.

Holy Spirit ¹—is named last, because it is the consequence of the two former (Rom. viii. 9 ; Gal. iv. 6), and continues (Rom. vii. 6, viii. 4 ff., 26 f.) and brings to perfection (Rom. viii. 11 ; Gal. vi. 8) their work in men. — *μετὰ πάντων ὑμῶν*] *sc. εἴη*. Seal of holy apostolic love after so much severe censure, *one thing for all*. (N⁷)

NOTES BY AMERICAN EDITOR.

(H⁷) *Paul's visits to Corinth.* Ver. 1.

All the recent expositors save Stanley and Plumptre (in Ellicott's Commentary) agree that the language of this verse implies that the Apostle had already visited Corinth twice. There is a good note on the subject by Dr. Poor in the American edition of Lange.

(I⁷) "*We also are weak in Him.*" Ver. 4.

This weakness is not a moral weakness, nor is it bodily infirmities or sufferings, nor yet a weakness in the estimation of others, *i.e.*, that he was despised. It is antithetical to power, and as the power referred to was that of punishment, the weakness must be the absence of such power. "The Apostle in Christ, *i.e.*, in virtue of his fellowship with Christ, was when in Corinth weak and forbearing, as though he had no power to vindicate his authority ; just as Christ was weak in the hands of His enemies when they led Him away to be crucified. But as Christ's weakness was voluntary, as there rested latent in the suffering Lamb of God the resources of Almighty power ; so in the meek, forbearing Apostle was the plenitude of supernatural power which he derived from his ascended Master" (Hodge).

(J⁷) "*Prove your own selves.*" Ver. 5.

The exhortation, Hodge argues, supposes on one hand that faith is self-manifesting, that it reveals itself in consciousness and by its fruits ; and on the other, that it may exist and be genuine and yet not be known as true faith by the believer himself. [The poet Cowper is a case in point.] Only what is doubtful needs to be determined by examination.

(K⁷) "*Except ye be reprobates.*" Ver. 5.

The Revised Version retains the closing word here, putting it as an adjective and not a noun. Of course it neither does nor can have the theological sense

¹ Estius, Calovius, and Hammond understand *κοινωνία* of the *communicatio activa* of the Holy Spirit, which, doubtless, as τοῦ πνεύμ. ἁγ. would be *genitivus subjecti*, is in accordance with the preceding clauses, and not at variance with the linguistic usage of *κοινωνία* in itself (Fritzsche, *ad Rom.* III. pp. 81, 287), but is in opposition to the usage throughout in the N. T. (see on Rom. xv. 26 ; 1 Cor. x. 16), and not in keeping with passages like Phil. ii. 1 ; 1 Cor. i. 9 ; 2 Pet. i. 4, —passages which have as their basis

the habitually employed conception of the *participation* in the divine, which takes place in the case of the Christian. Hence also not : *familiaris consuetudo* with the Holy Spirit (Ch. F. Fritzsche, *Opusc.* p. 276). Theophylact well remarks : τὴν κοινωνίαν τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος, τουτέστι τὴν μετοχὴν αὐτοῦ καὶ τὴν μετέληψιν, καθ' ἣν ἁγιαζόμεθα, τῇ ἐφ' ἡμᾶς ἐπιφοιτήσει τοῦ παρακλήτου κοινωνοὶ αὐτοῦ γεόμενοι καὶ αὐτοὶ, οὐκ οὐσία, ἀλλὰ μετέξει ὄντες.

of "one judicially abandoned to perdition," but simply means those who cannot stand the test and are disapproved.

(L⁷) "*We can do nothing against the truth.*" Ver. 8.

It follows from Dr. Meyer's just exposition of this utterance that Paul's decision, if against the truth, availed nothing before God. The doctrine of Rome, that discipline is valid and effectual, even *clave errante*, is refuted by this text. What the church binds on earth is bound in heaven only when it is in accordance with the truth.

(M⁷) *The condition of peace.* Ver. 11.

In reference to the two latter clauses of the verse, Hodge calls attention to the "familiar Christian paradox." God's presence produces love and peace, and we must have love and peace in order to have His presence. God gives, but we must cherish His gifts. His agency does not supersede ours, but mingles with it and becomes one with it in our consciousness. We work out our own salvation while God works in us.

(N⁷) *The comprehensive benediction.* Ver. 14.

It is remarkable that an Epistle written under a tempest of conflicting emotions and often breathing indignation, reproach, and sorrow, should close with the richest of all the benedictions of the New Testament. The grace of the Lord Jesus stands first, because it is by it, as Bengel says, that the love of God reaches us. It is indeed the necessary condition of its manifestation, for we are reconciled to God by the death of His Son. The love of God, again, is the source of redemption. It is manifested in His sending his only-begotten into the world, for God so loved the world that he gave, etc. The communion of the Holy Ghost is not communion with Him, but participation in Him, the holy fellowship mediated by His indwelling with the Father and with the Son, and with all that belong to the one mystical body of Christ.—The distinct personality and the deity of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit being here plainly implied, the benediction is a clear recognition of the Trinity, the fundamental doctrine of Christianity.

TOPICAL INDEX.

A.

Aaronic Blessing, 13.
 Absolution, 269.
 Abstinence, 189 seq. ; for others' good, 191 seq.
 Achaia, 6 ; churches of, 11, 400 seq., 416.
 Adam, The first and the last, 379 seq. ; the fall of, 640 seq., 667.
 Adiaphora, 190, 192, 193.
 Admonition, 101.
 Affliction, 417 seq., 436, 437, 419 seq. ; a special, 420 seq. ; in ministerial work, 494 seq., 505, 547 seq., 548 seq. ; compensations of, 503, 505, 507.
 Agapae, 258, 259, 271, 328.
 Aim of the Christian Life, 213 seq., 216.
 Amen, 323, 335, 433.
 Anathema, Maranatha, 404 seq., 406.
 Angels, 129 seq. ; the judging of, 145 ; as guardians, 253 ; the language of, 301.
 Aphrodite, worship of, 1.
 Apollos, 2 ; his party, 19 seq., 84, 183 ; and the resurrection, 340 ; to visit Corinth, 399.
 Apostles, sent of God, 98 ; suffer privations, 99 seq. ; married, 215 ; witnesses of Christ's resurrection, 344 seq.
 Apostolic, greeting, 9, 13, 403 seq., 416 seq. ; teaching, 26 ; benevolence, 394 seq.
 Appearances, Regard for, 594, 598.
 Aquila, 1.
 Arbitration, 128, 131 seq.
 Asceticism, 214, 260.
 Atonement, The, 264 seq. ; faith in, 267 ; the central fact, 343 ; effect of, 522 ; its benefits, 529 seq., 542 seq. ; the doctrine of, 539 seq., 543.
 Avaricious, The, warned against, 120, 121.

B.

Baptism, and faith, 24 ; and Paul, 25 seq. ; delegated to assistants, 26 ; effect of, 66 ; regeneration in, 135, 146 ; of infants, 160, 179 ; the sym-

bols of, 219 seq., 242 ; in the Holy Spirit, 289 ; for the dead, 364 seq., 366 seq., 368, 392.
 "Being saved," 39 seq.
 Benevolence, commended, 237, 242, 394 seq. ; exhibited, 578 seq., 597, 580 seq. ; exhortation to, 583 seq., 601 seq. ; the divine measure of, 588 seq. ; equal and universal, 590 seq., 598 ; voluntary, 604 seq. ; blessings of, 609 seq.
 Benediction, The Triune, 710, 712.
 Bible, The, its chief aim, 40 ; its spiritual interpretation, 56 seq.
 Blessing, Aaronic, 13.
 Boasting, forbidden, 36, 81, 84 seq., commanded, 38 ; disapproved of, 627 seq. ; in God, 635 ; of Paul, 654 seq., 671 seq.
 Body, The, 141 seq. ; a temple, 144 seq. ; its membership, 291 seq. ; divinely designed, 293 seq. ; nature of its resurrection, 373 seq., 375 seq., 377 seq., 393, 512 seq., 541 ; kinds of, 378 seq., 383, 384, 507 seq. ; translation of, 520.
 Brothers of Christ, 198 seq.

C.

Calvin, and the Lord's Supper, 231 seq.
 Canon, of the Bible, 125.
 Catechism, Teachings of the, 61.
 Celibacy, 150 seq., 152 seq., 154, 155 seq., 169 seq., 174 seq., 176 seq., 178 seq., 180, 197.
 Cephas, his party, 19 seq. ; mentioned, 199 ; witness of Christ's resurrection, 343.
 Change, A universal, 384 seq., 393.
 Chloe, 18 seq.
 Childhood condition, 306, 310 ; in judgment and malice, 323 seq.
 Christ Jesus, invocation of, 11 ; fellowship with, 10, 13 ; imparts knowledge, 13 seq. ; his second coming, 15, 16, 74, 84, 91, 355 seq. ; a party of, 20 seq. ; if divided, 24 seq. ; proclaimed, 31 seq. ; as the Crucified, 32 seq., 391 ; our wisdom and righteousness, 37 seq., 41 ; his

- crucifixion, 50 ; his mind, 59 seq. ; the foundation, 70 seq., 73 ; subordinated, 83, 85 ; the paschal lamb, 116 ; His brothers, 198 seq. ; as the Rock, 221, 222, 242 ; his Divinity, 243 ; the head, 246 seq. ; confessing, 298 ; His resurrection, 342 seq., 352 seq. ; His final triumph, 359 seq., 361 seq. ; the glory of His resurrection body, 382 ; the author of victory, 390 ; the life of believers, 497 seq. ; died for all, 529 seq., 542 seq. ; the righteousness of God, 539 seq. ; his humiliation, 584 seq., 597 ; will triumph over all, 621.
- Christian, The, possessing all, 81, 82, 84, 501 ; belonging to Christ, 84 seq. ; as God's steward, 87 seq. ; enduring privations, 96 seq. ; to be purified, 115 seq., 124 ; to be holy, 117 ; to be a judge, 128 seq., 145 ; of angels, 129 seq. ; forbidden to litigate, 127 seq., 131 seq., 133 seq. ; to be self-master, 139 ; united with Christ, 142 ; bought with a price, 168, 196 ; striving for the goal, 213 ; his rule of conduct, 241 ; to imitate Christ, 246 ; to seek after love, 300-312 ; to be raised first, 355 seq. ; the nature of his calling, 400 ; a sweet savour to God, 453 seq. ; the glory of, 480 seq., 482 seq. ; his power of life, 497 seq. ; their afflictions and their glory, 503, 505, 548, 558 ; walking by faith, 503 ; striving to please God, 521 seq. ; a new creature, 533 seq. ; a coworker with God, 544 seq. ; his righteous conduct, 548 seq. ; his moral duty, 551 seq. ; the temple of God, 556, 558 ; the riches of, 584 seq.
- Christianity, The blessings of, 14 seq. ; and nature, 272.
- Christ-party, The, 83 seq. ; 150, 183.
- Circumcision, 165.
- Church, The, founded on Christ, 70 seq. ; its building materials, 72 ; the abode of the Spirit, 78 seq. ; its teachers, 84 ; its basis, 104 seq., 106 ; its discipline, 111 seq., 124 ; scandal in the, 115 ; to be purified, 115 seq., 124 ; united to Christ, 145 ; as Christ's body, 294 seq. ; government in, 295 seq. ; to be edified, 320, 321 seq. ; the temple of God, 624 seq.
- Comfort, from God, 417 seq., 436, 439 seq., 502, 565 seq.
- Collections, 395, 580 seq., 586 seq., 593 seq., 600 seq.
- Communion, 229 seq., 231 seq., 233 seq., 236 seq., 243.
- Communism, 590 seq., 598, 612, 613.
- Companionship with evil, 372 seq.
- Conduct, Rule of, 241 ; righteous, 548 seq.
- Confession, of sin, 269 ; of Christ, 297.
- Confidence, desired, 561 ; secured, 574 seq., 576.
- Conscience, 89 ; of the heathen, 188 ; under temptation, 190 seq. ; violated, 191 ; treatment of, 191 ; in eating sacrificial meats, 238, 239 ; testimony of, 424 seq.
- Contentiousness, reproved, 256 seq., 272 seq., 692 seq., 698.
- Continency, 154.
- Conversion, 167, 528, 535.
- Conviction, of the heart, 460, 483.
- Corinth, The Church at, 1 ; its un-mixed character, 2 ; its divisions, 3 seq. ; receives Paul's Epistles, 6 ; its parties, 12 ; favored with gifts, 14 seq. ; a testimony for Paul, 461 seq. ; Paul's visit to, 700, 711.
- Corinthians, Epistles to the, apocryphal, 4 seq.
- Corinthians, First Epistle to the, 4 ; occasion of writing, 5 ; aim and contents, 5 ; to whom written, 6 ; place and time of writing, 6, 118 ; its genuineness, 6 seq. ; its address, 11 seq.
- Corinthians, Second Epistle to the, 409 ; occasion of writing, 410 ; aim, 411 ; contents, 411, 412 ; place of writing, 412 seq. ; genuineness of, 413 ; unity of, 414.
- Communicant, The worthy, 269, 273.
- Covenant, 264 seq. ; the new and the old, 464 seq., 466 seq., 483, 474 seq., 484, 475 seq.
- Covetousness, 603, 613.
- Creation, Mosaic account of, 272.
- Creatures of God, good, 238.
- Crispus, 1 ; baptized by Paul, 25.
- Cross of Christ, 27 ; preached, 31 seq. ; its influence with the Jews, 32.
- Crucifixion of Christ, 50.
- Culture, opposed to the Gospel, 2.

D.

Dancing, 223.

Dead, Raising the, 282, 338, 340, 348, 350, 352, 353, 354, 355, 374, 376, 383, 385, 386, 387, 391, 392, 393.

Death, through man, 353 ; universal, 353 seq. ; the last enemy overcome, 360 seq. ; done away with, 388 seq. ; a transition state, 374, 392 seq. ; the sentence of, 422, 437 ; eternal, 466 ; no fear of, 516 ; ethical, universal, 529, 542.

Decrees of God, 87.
 Deceit, reprov'd, 652.
 Defilement, 189.
 Deliverance, promised, 226 seq. ; of God, 422, 436 ; prayer for, 684.
 Demons, or devils, 235 seq.
 Dependence, Mutual, 290, 292.
 Desertion, 161 seq., 179 seq.
 Discernment, of Scripture, 56 seq., 58 seq.
 Discipline of the Spirit, 105 ; of the Church, 111 seq., 121, 122, 124, 192, 445 seq., 456 ; unto edification, 709.
 Discontent of Christians, 223 seq.
 Discrepancy of Scripture, 223, 243.
 Dissensions, reprov'd, 257 seq. ; uses of, 273.
 Divorce, 109, 156 seq., 158 seq., 160 seq., 171 seq., 178, 179, 180.
 Doctrines, Development of, 72.
 Drunkard, The, warned against, 121.

E.

Earnestness, manifested, 601 seq.
 Easter, 118.
 Ebionitism, 23.
 Ecstasy, 672.
 Edification, 320 ; by prayer, 321 seq. ; in discourse, 335 ; in all teaching, 329, 336, 691.
 Elections, Church, 593.
 Election, Divine, 34 seq., 185.
 Encouragement, 517, 519.
 End, The, of the Resurrection, 356 ; of the world, 385 seq., 392, 511.
 Endowment, 295.
 Ephesus, 6, 398, 405.
 Epicureanism, 149, 339 ; its immoral maxims, 369 seq.
 Epistle, A lost, 118 seq., 125.
 Equality, Christian, 167.
 Essenes, 22, 150.
 Eve, The fall of, 640 seq., 667.
 Evil Angels, 225, 253.
 Evil, The rights of, 137 seq. ; avoidance of, 241 seq., 707 ; association with, 372 seq. ; renounced, 487 seq.
 Excommunication, 109 ; enforced, 111 seq., 113 seq., 124.
 Exhortation, to steadfastness, 342, 390 seq., 391, 400, 405, 433 seq.
 Expediency, Christian, 137 seq. ; the rule of, 191, 192 seq. ; its application, 237.

F.

Factions, The, 39, 123.
 Faith, perseverance in, 16 ; and baptism, 24 seq. ; based on God's power, 46 ; saving, 281 seq. ; without love, 302 ; and love, 308 seq., 310 seq. ; dependent on Christ's resurrection, 349

seq. ; steadfastness in the, 342, 390, 391, 400, 405, 433 seq., 438 ; the spirit of, 498 ; in Christ's salvation, 499 ; walking by, 518, 541 ; appropriating salvation, 535 ; increase of, 632 seq.
 Faithfulness of God, 227 seq., 243, 431, 437.
 Fasting, 547, 557.
 Fatherhood, Spiritual, 218.
 Fear of God, The, 560 seq., 575.
 Feasts, Sacrificial, 182, 204, 227 seq., 233 seq., 235 seq.
 Fellowship, Christian, 159 seq., 229 seq., 231 seq., 401 seq., 403 seq., 418 seq., 441 seq., 610 seq.
 Fellowship, with Christ, 10, 13, 16, 142 ; in the Lord's Supper, 229, 230 seq. ; with unbelievers, 554 seq., 558 ; with saints, 580 seq.
 Fidelity, 88 ; decided by God, 89 seq. ; to one's calling, 165 seq., 169, 180.
 Folly, reprov'd, 80.
 Forbearance, 191, 239 seq., 444 seq., 456.
 Forgiveness, 443 seq., 446 seq., 448 seq.
 Fornication, 108 seq., 119 seq., 121 seq., 123, 137 seq., 139 seq., 141 seq., 143 seq., 151 seq., 223.
 Foundation, The, laid, 70, 73.
 Freedom, Moral, 137 seq., 154, 163, 167, 172, 189, 236, 238, 239 seq. ; in the Spirit, 479 seq.

G.

Gaius, 25.
 Gallio, 2.
 Gifts, bestowed, 14 seq. ; all from God, 95 seq., of the Holy Spirit, 275, 277 seq., 479 seq. ; classes of, 280 seq., 282 ; in the church, 295 seq., distributed, 296.
 Glory of God, sought for, 241, 243 seq. ; completed, 393 ; in Christ, 493, 502, 504.
 Glory, to be revealed, 50 seq., 481 seq., 485.
 God, his faithfulness, 16, 227 ; confounds the world's wisdom, 28 ; manifests His own wisdom, 30 seq., 33 seq. ; His choice of means, 35 seq. ; secures us salvation, 36 seq. ; glorying in, 38 ; revealed through the Spirit, 52 ; source of spiritual growth, 69 seq. ; His wrath, 77 ; as Judge 122 seq. ; the only Deity, 168 seq. ; as Creator, 238 seq. ; His glory, 241, 243 ; His absolute sovereignty, 362 seq. ; and the resurrection body, 375 ; the Father of Mercies, 436 ; trust in, 422 ; giveth

victory, 452 seq., 457 ; man's sufficiency, 455, 457, 463 seq. ; giveth the Spirit, 517.
 Gospel, The, proclaimed to the lower classes, 1 ; established in the believer's soul, 14 ; proclaimed, 30, 340 ; without charge, 209 ; opposition to, 398, 405 ; not changeable, 432 ; triumph of, 621 seq.
 Government, in the Church, 295 seq.
 Grace of God, The, in Christ, 13 ; powerful in Paul, 347 seq. ; imparted through him, 428 ; in vain, 545, 557 ; given to liberal churches, 578 ; freely given, 607 seq. ; sufficient for all trials, 684 seq.
 Greeks, The, litigious, 145 seq.
 Greeting, Apostolic, 9, 13, 403 seq., 416 seq., farewell, 710.

H.

Head-covering, in prayer, 247 seq., 249 seq., 251 seq., 255 seq., 272.
 Heathen gods, 185 seq.
 Heathenism, 235 seq. ; intercourse with, 554 seq., 558.
 Heathen vices, 121 seq.
 Heaven, longing for, 510 seq., 515 seq., 519 seq., 541, 542 ; our home, 518 ; the number of heavens, 674 seq., 696 ; visions of, 677.
 Holiness, in Christ, 37 seq., 117 ; to be established, 560 seq., 575.
 Holy Spirit, The, his gifts, 14 seq., 275, 279 seq., 281 seq., 287 seq., 314 seq. ; revelation of, 51 seq. ; dwelling in the church, 78 seq., 461 seq. ; his gentleness, 105 ; a symbol of, 219 ; imparted, 289 ; given to the church, 295 ; to human prophets, 332 seq., anointing of, 434 seq., 437 seq. ; dedicating the ministry, 468 ; giving life, 464 seq. ; giving liberty, 479 seq. ; from God, 517.
 Honesty, recommended, 594.
 Humanity, to the brute creation, 200, 215.
 Humility, The rule of, 93 seq. ; enforced, 95 seq. ; exemplified, 212 ; enjoined, 226.
 Husband, Duties of a, 152 seq.

I.

Idols and Idolatry, 182 seq., 185 seq., 188 seq., 190 seq., 192, 223, 227, 233 seq., 276.
 Immortality, 374 seq., 377 seq., 381 seq. ; longing for, 510, 515 seq., 541.
 Impressions, False, corrected, 691 seq., 698.
 Incest, 5, 108 seq. ; how punished, 111 seq.

Incontinency, 153.
 Indulgence of Sin, 224.
 Infant Baptism, 160, 179.
 Infirmities, 685, 697.
 Inspiration, 568, 575.
 Intercourse, with sinners, 119 seq., 121 seq. ; with unbelievers, 554 seq., 558.
 Intermediate State, The, 39, 340.
 Interpretation, Scripture, 55 seq., 61 seq. ; the gift of, 321 seq., 334 seq.
 Interpretation, The gift of, 283 seq., 324 seq.
 Irony, Apostolic, 96, 98 ; of Paul, 106, 459 seq., 638 seq., 641 seq., 655 seq., 687 seq.
 Israelites, The, 218 ; their exodus, 219 ; in the Wilderness, 221 ; their sacrifices, 228 ; their hardening, 473 seq. ; blinded, 475 seq. ; enlightened, 476.
 Isthmian Games, 212 seq.

J.

James, the brother of Christ, 21 ; witness of Christ's resurrection, 345.
 Jealousy, godly, 639 seq., 667.
 Jerusalem, The church at, 394 seq.
 Jesuits, The first, 22.
 Joy, in tribulation, 564 seq., 566 seq. ; secured, 573 seq.
 Judaists, 23.
 Judgment Day, The, 15, 74 seq., 84, 90 seq., 128 seq., 225, 386 seq., 499 seq., 505, 522.
 Judgments of God, 28, 79, 122 seq., 271 ; to be vindicated, 622, 653, 667 ; foretold, 693 seq.
 Judgments of Men, 90, 122.
 Justification, 135 seq., 146 ; by faith and love, 309 ; the doctrine of, 539 seq., 543.
 Justus, 1 ; the church in his house, 2.

K.

Kiss, An holy, 403, 710.
 Knowledge, 183 seq., 192 ; its conceit, 184 ; its abuse, 191 ; as a gift, 281 ; the word of, 298 ; without love, 302 ; imperfect, 305 seq., 307 seq. ; according to the Spirit, 531 seq.
 Knowledge of God, revealed, 52 ; a matter of experience, 184 seq. ; the light of the, 492 seq., 505.
 Knowledge, through Christ, 13 seq. ; of Christ, 531.

L.

Labor, and its Reward, 200 seq., 215, 390 seq.
 Law, The, as higher authority, 199 ; of Moses, 467, 475 seq.

Lawsuits forbidden, 127 seq., 131 seq., 133 seq., 145 seq.

Leaven, 114 seq.

Letters of Commendation, 459, 461.

Liberality, commended, 237, 242, 394 seq.; exhibited, 578 seq., 597, 580 seq.; exhortation to, 583 seq.; the divine measure of, 588 seq.; equal and universal, 589 seq., 598; free and cordial, 605; the reward of, 605 seq.; its spirit, 607 seq., 613 seq.; blessings of, 609 seq.

Liberty, Christian, 137 seq., 180, 189 seq., 236, 238, 239 seq.; in the Spirit, 479 seq.

Life, Spiritual, activity of, 450.

Liturgies, Eucharistic, 266.

Living for Christ, 530.

Lord's Supper, The, 117, 219 seq., 228 seq., 230 seq., 232 seq., 243, 259; disorders at, 260 seq., its institution, 261; its doctrine and celebration, 263 seq., 265 seq.; liturgies of, 266; worthy reception of, 267 seq., 273; Zwinglian view of, 268; self-examination for, 269; unworthy reception of, 269 seq.; its transfiguring power, 514.

Love, 184 seq., 192; as a gift, 297, 299; the want of, 300 seq., 302; excellency of, 303 seq., 313; personified, 303; its characteristics, 304 seq.; its imperishableness, 305 seq.; and faith and hope, 308 seq., 310 seq.; description of, 310; the greatest gift, 310 seq.; in all things, 400; its exercise, 447, 552 seq.; constraining, 527 seq., 542; exhibited in benevolence, 583 seq., 597; brotherly, 596.

Love Feasts, 122, 258, 259, 271.

Lutheran Church, Evangelical, The, its doctrinal development, 72; and the Lord's Supper, 230 seq., 263 seq., 270.

M.

Macedonia, 397; receiving grace, 578; showing benevolence, 578 seq., 580 seq.

Man, his spiritual condition, 57 seq., 65; with Christ's spirit, 60; the temple of God, 78; over woman, 246 seq.; with head covered in prayer, 247 seq., 249 seq., 255; dependent on woman, 254 seq.

Man, The Natural, 64 seq., 67.

Marriage, 149 seq., 151 seq., 155 seq., 158 seq., 162 seq., 170 seq., 173 seq., 178 seq., 180, 189, 250, 252 seq.; from a Christian standpoint, 254 seq.; mixed marriages, 158, 159,

161, 178 seq.; with unbelievers, 554 seq., 558.

Martyrdom, 303.

Meat, offered to idols, 183, 185, 188 seq., 190 seq.; abstinence from, 191, 233 seq., 237 seq., 239 seq.

Memory, Confusion of the, 61.

Messianic Kingdom, The, 10, 17, 74 seq., 84, 96 seq.; its basis, 104 seq., 106; its advent, 305; its development, 308 seq.; its end, 356, 358.

Millennium, The, 357 seq., 359.

Mind of Christ, The, 59 seq.

Ministerial Support, 200 seq., 202 seq., 204 seq.

Ministry, The Christian, 466; its glory, 467, 486; its dedication, 468, 470; free from sin, 487; sufferings in the, 495 seq., 505, 547 seq., 549 seq.; of reconciliation, 535, 537 seq.; its moral power, 546, 547.

Miracles, The gift of, 282.

Modesty, The rule of, 93 seq.; enforced, 95 seq.

Monasticism, 197.

Monks, The first, 22.

Monotheism, of the New Testament, 83.

Moses, 218; his ministry, 467 seq., 469 seq., 471 seq., 473 seq., 484, 475 seq.

Murmuring, against spiritual authority, 224.

Musical instruments, 317.

Mystery of God, revealed, 52.

Mythology, Heathen, 186.

N.

Nature, conformity to, 255, 272.

New Testament, its practical character, 393; its monotheism, 83.

O.

Obedience, to authority, 447, 456.

Offence, giving no, 242 seq.

Old Testament, Manner of quoting the, 556 seq., 558.

Order, in God's kingdom, 246 seq.; in public worship, 331 seq., 333, 335, 336.

Organic Nature, its glory in diversity, 375 seq.

P.

Paradise, 676 seq.

Pardon, 443 seq., 448 seq.

Parousia, The, 16, 74 seq., 114, 225 seq., 305 seq., 355 seq., 385 seq., 387 seq., 404 seq., 427, 467 seq., 484, 507 seq., 511 seq., 541.

Partisanship at Corinth, 19 seq.; rebuked, 24 seq., 91 seq., 96 seq., 123; considered, 39, 67 seq.

- Paschal Lamb, The, 116 seq.
 Passover, The, 116 seq., 118.
 Paul, at Corinth, 1 ; at Athens, 2 ;
 his authority attacked, 3 ; writes
 his first Epistle, 5 ; his visits to
 Corinth, 6 ; his greeting, 9 seq. ;
 called by God's will, 9 ; full of
 Christ, 15 ; exhorts to unity, 17 ;
 his party, 19 seq., 84 ; his relation
 to baptism, 25 seq. ; his function as
 a teacher, 26 ; preaches Christ,
 31 seq., 43 seq. ; rebukes party
 strife, 67 seq. ; lays the foundation,
 70 ; as spiritual father, 102 seq. ;
 sends Timothy, 103 ; his plenary
 authority, 111 seq. ; his unmarried
 state, 155, 175, 215 ; and circumci-
 sion, 192 seq. ; his vision of Christ,
 196 ; his claim as apostle, 196 seq.,
 215 ; his secular occupation, 199 ;
 means of support, 205 seq., 647 ;
 his apostolic reward, 208 ; all things
 to all men, 210 seq. ; divine revela-
 tion to, 263, 273 ; as a teacher,
 316 ; a witness of Christ's resurrec-
 tion, 346 ; his humility, 346 seq. ; in-
 fluenced by God's grace, 347 ; in dai-
 ly suffering, 369, 547 seq., 549 seq. ;
 his conflict with wild beasts, 369
 seq. ; writes numerous letters, 396 ;
 reason of his comfort, 419 seq. ; his
 plan of journey, 427 seq. ; a messen-
 ger of grace, 428 ; a man of word,
 429 seq. ; not Lord over the faith,
 435 seq. ; his forbearance, 444 seq.,
 456 ; his forgiveness, 443 seq. ;
 quotes from the Psalms, 498, 505 ;
 persuades men, 523 seq. ; manifests
 zeal, 526 ; an ambassador of God,
 538 seq. ; his fraternal love, 562 seq. ;
 desires confidence, 561 ; secures it,
 574 seq., 576 ; vindicates his author-
 ity, 617 seq., 619 seq., 625 ; his
 bodily presence, 626, 636 ; his prov-
 ince, 631, 636 ; indulges in irony,
 638 seq. ; his speech, 644 seq. ; his
 gratuitous service, 646 seq., 667 ;
 indulges in boasting, 654 seq. ;
 667 seq. ; relates his sufferings,
 660 seq. ; his escape from Damascus,
 666 ; his special revelations, 671 seq. ;
 receives a thorn in the flesh,
 680 seq. ; works signs and wonders,
 687 ; threatens discipline, 700 seq. ;
 farewell exhortation and greeting,
 709 seq.
 Peace, Conditions of, 709 seq., 712.
 Perfect, The, 60 seq.
 Pentateuch, its divine authority, 272.
 Pentecost, 398.
 Perseverance, in faith, 16.
 Peter, 3 ; the party of, 83 seq. ; a mar-
 ried man, 150 ; his wife, 199 ; his
 primacy, 644.
 Petrine party, 150, 189, 196, 404.
 Philosophy, Christian, 47, 48.
 Polygamy, 152.
 Poverty, of the Primitive Church,
 394 ; of Macedonia, 579, 596 seq.
 Power, 104 seq., 215.
 Prayer, demeanour in, 247, 249 seq.,
 251 seq., 255 seq. ; with understand-
 ing, 321 seq. ; of thanksgiving, 323,
 423 seq. ; intercessory, 423, 707.
 Preaching, of Paul, 26 seq., 431, 437 ;
 of the Cross, 27 ; its foolishness,
 30 ; its nature and aim, 31 seq.,
 43 seq., 54 seq. ; with recompense,
 206 ; a necessity, 206, 216 ;
 its Messianic reward, 207 ; in un-
 known tongues, 316 seq., 319, 321,
 327 seq., 330 seq., 334 seq. ; depend-
 ent on Christ's resurrection, 349
 seq. ; ability in, from God, 455, 457 ;
 Christ, 491 seq. ; gratuitously, 646
 seq., 667 ; for deliverance, 684.
 Predestination, 27, 49, 453 seq., 457.
 Pride of Party, rebuked, 91 seq.
 Priesthood, The Levitical, 466 seq.
 Priests, 204.
 Progress, Moral and Spiritual, 305 seq.
 Promises of God, certain, 433, 560.
 Prophecy, of the Old Testament, 28 ;
 Prophecy, The gift of, 282, 314 seq.,
 316 seq., 331 seq. ; without love, 302 ;
 its design, 326 seq., 328 ; its order,
 331 seq., 334 seq.
 Providence of God, 180, 200 seq., 215.
 Punishment, remedial, 114 ; admin-
 istered, 445 seq., 446 ; for deeds
 done, 521 seq., 542, 653, 667, 694
 seq.
 Purgatory, 74, 84.
 Purification of the Church, 115 seq.,
 123, 124.
 Purity, Moral, 175.

Q.

 Quotations, 40.

R.

 Rabbinical Exposition, 473, 484.
 Rebuke, administered, 442 seq.
 Reconciliation, 534 seq., 542 seq.,
 536 seq.
 Redemption in Christ, 37 seq., 47,
 534, 542 seq., 539, 543 ; the price of,
 144, 168.
 Regeneration, 135, 534.
 Religion, The beginning of, 66.
 Renunciation, of self, 209 seq., 216.
 Repentance, 113 ; unto salvation, 569
 seq., 576.
 Reprobates, 706, 711 seq.

Responses, 322 seq., 335, 433.
 Restoration, The doctrine of, 363 seq.
 Resurrection, of Christ, 340, 343 ; witnesses of, 344 seq., 346 ; the central doctrine, 349 seq. ; its certainty, 352 seq., 499 ; its glory, 490 seq.
 Resurrection of the Dead, 338 seq., 340 seq., 499, 507, 512, 541 ; denied by some, 348 seq. ; terrible alternatives of, 350 seq., 352 seq. ; through man, 353 ; universal, 354 seq. ; in complete order, 355 seq. ; nature of their bodies, 374 seq., 376 seq., 383 seq., 386, 387, 392 seq. ; the time of, 385.
 Reward, of work, 69, 74 seq., of deeds done, 521 seq., 542.
 Revelations, Divine, 331 seq. ; special, to Paul, 671 seq.
 Righteousness, in Christ, 37 seq., 135, 539 seq., 543.
 Rubrics, Primitive, 336.

S.

Sacrament, The idea of a, 220 ; the number of, 242.
 Sacrifices, 182, 204, 227, 228, 233 seq., 235 seq.
 Sadduceeism, 338 seq.
 Saints, on earth, 10 seq.
 Salvation, from God, 16, 36 seq. ; by the Cross, 27 ; by preaching, 30 seq. ; its proper understanding, 39 seq. ; revealed by the Spirit 52 ; degrees of, 76 seq., 522, 542 ; the gift of grace, 76 ; with difficulty, 84 ; of God's calling, 164 ; its cause, 184 ; Messianic, 212 seq., 242 ; a life-struggle, 216 ; by the Gospel, 341 ; in the present, 546, 557.
 Sanctification, 10 seq., 135 seq., 146, 159.
 Satan, 111 seq. ; to be destroyed, 130 ; his devices, 449, 456 ; blinding man, 489 seq., 504 ; intercourse with, 555 ; and Adam's fall, 641, 667 ; his personality, 652 seq., 667 ; the angel, 681.
 Scandal, in the church, 115, 124.
 Schism, reprov'd, 293.
 Scripture, Unity of, 40.
 Sectarianism, at Corinth, 2 seq. ; rebuked, 17 seq., 24 seq. ; considered, 39, 67 seq. ; pride of, 91 seq., 96 seq.
 Self-conceit, 110, 627 seq., 631 seq., 636.
 Self-control, 213 seq., 218.
 Self-deception, 79 ; warned against, 226.
 Self-denial, 173 seq., 180, 202 seq., 210 seq., 216.

Self-devotion, 660 seq., 668, 689.
 Self-examination, 269, 270, 706.
 Selfishness, condemned, 237.
 Self-measurement, 628 seq., 631 seq., 636.
 Self-punishment, 214.
 Separation of Man and Wife, 156 seq., 178 seq.
 Services of Help, 294 seq., 299.
 Serving God, 236.
 Sex, Distinctions of, 140 seq., 272 ; subordination of, 247 seq., 249 seq., 251 seq., 272 ; Christian relations of, 254 seq.
 Silas, 1.
 Sin, warning against, 226 seq., 225 seq. ; incitements to, 226 ; to be punished, 702 seq.
 Slander, refuted, 689 seq., 697.
 Slavery, 166, 180 ; its abolition, 167.
 Social Exclusion, 118 seq.
 Sodomy, 134.
 Sorrow, godly, 569 seq., 576.
 Sosthenes, 9.
 Sowing and reaping, 202 seq.
 Spectacle of the Universe, 97 seq., 106.
 Speech, 104 seq.
 Spirit, The Human, 52 seq.
 Steadfastness, Exhortation to, 342, 390 seq., 391, 400, 405, 433 seq.
 Stephanas, 25, 401.
 Stewards of God, 87 seq.
 Stumbling-blocks, 189 seq.
 Subordination of Christ, 11, 83, 85, 247.
 Substitution, of Christ, 529 seq., 542 seq.
 Suicide, 143.
 Suffering, for the Gospel's sake, 203, 660 seq., 668.
 Suffering from God, 455, 457, 463.
 Sunday, its practical observance, 395, 405.

T.

Teachers, A Divine Order of, not instituted, 5 ; their ability, 316 ; to speak in their own language, 324, 336.
 Teaching of the Apostles, 26 ; of Christ's disciples, 73 ; tried by fire, 74 seq. ; not restricted to office, 329, 336.
 Temptations, 226 ; help in, 227.
 Tempting God, 233 seq.
 Thanksgiving, 238, 243, 323, 390, 417, 436, 423 seq., 451 seq., 501, 608 seq., 612.
 Things eternal and temporal, 503.
 Thorn in the flesh, Paul's, 680 seq.
 Timothy, 1, 416 ; sent to Corinth, 5, 103, 398, 409 ; his conversion, 103.

Titus, 1 ; his joy, 574 ; to gather contributions, 582 ; sent to Corinth, 591 seq. ; companion of Paul, 592 ; commended, 594 seq.

Tongues, The gift of, 275 seq., 277 seq., 279 seq., 284 seq., 286 seq., 296, 298, 300 seq., 314 seq., 316 seq., 324 seq., 327 seq., 330 seq., 336.

Tonsure, The, 255.

Traditions, 246, 271 ; historical, 343.

Translation, of the body, 520.

Transubstantiation, 270.

Trinity, The, 279 ; recognized, 710, 712.

Trumpet, The, 318 ; at the resurrection, 387.

Trust in God, 422.

Truth, 304 ; manifested, 488 ; alone decisive, 708, 712.

U.

Unbelievers, at law with, 133 seq., 145 seq. ; lost, 488 seq., 504 ; blinded by Satan, 489 seq., 504 seq.

Unchastity, 5.

Uncircumcision, 165 seq., 180.

Union with Christ, 10, 13, 142, 231 seq.

Unity, Christian, enjoined, 17 seq. ; in the Lord's Supper, 232 seq. ; of believers, 290.

Unrighteousness, endured, 133 seq.

Utterance, imparted by Christ, 13.

V.

Veil, as a covering, 251 seq., 256 ; as a symbol, 253.

Vices, excluding from the kingdom, 134.

Vision, Ecstatic, 676 seq., 697.

Victory, through God, 452 seq., 457.

Virgins, and Virgin Life, 169, 174, 177 seq.

Virtues, The theological, 308 seq.

W.

Warfare, carnal, 619 seq. ; spiritual, 620 seq., 635 seq.

Warning, against sin, 222 seq., 225, 226, 372 seq., 694 seq.

Weakness, Moral, 270 ; physical, 684 ; becomes strength, 685 seq., 704 seq.

Wicked, The, judged, 123 ; not to enter heaven, 134.

Widowers, 155.

Widows, 156.

Wife, Duties of a, 152 seq., 174 seq.

Will of God, The, 291.

Wisdom, Christian, 281 ; the word of, 298.

Wisdom, of the world, 28 seq., 425 ; of God, 30 seq., 33 seq., 35 seq., 45 seq., 48 seq., 60 seq. ; in Christ, 37 seq. ; its glorious character, 41 ; revealed by the Spirit, 46 ; religious wisdom, 47 ; worldly wisdom rebuked, 79 seq.

Woman, her rank, 246 seq. ; her demeanor in public prayer, 247 seq., 249 seq., 255 seq. ; the glory of man, 251 seq., 272 ; dependent upon man, 254 seq. ; to be silent in public worship, 333 seq., 336.

Workers with God, 69 ; rewarded, 74 seq.

Works, without love, 302.

World-power, and wisdom, 35 seq.

Worship, of Christ, 11.

Worship, public, 247 seq., 249 seq., 251 seq., 255 seq. ; 327 seq., 329 seq. ; with the understanding, 322 ; order in, 331 seq., 333, 335, 336 ; woman in, 333 seq., 336.

Wrath of God, 77, 79.

Z.

Zeal, after gifts, 296, 297, 299, 313 seq., 319 ; for God, 526 seq. ; disciplinary, 571, 576 ; awakened, 572 ; given of God, 591, 598 ; stimulated, 601 seq.

Zwingli, his view of the Lord's Supper, 231, 268.

THE LIBRARY OF THE

MAY 23 1933

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS.

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS-URBANA



3 0112 075870136